The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1907.

The Week.

Speaker Cannon is the real St. George of the standpatters. He slew a tremendous dragon two years ago, killing outright a special tariff message which was just blinking in the unaccustomed light, and would have been on the helpless nation in a few days more. He killed another moderate-sized dragon, so his admirers say, in the shape of a tariff paragraph in the last Presidential message. The latest one he has killed was merely an allusion to the tariff in Mr. Roosevelt's Indianapolis speech. It was hardly more than a snap-dragon, but its decapitation gives Mr. Cannon an absolutely clean record in the matter of dragons. Heroes seldom buy new weapons, and in this respect also the standpat champion sustains the best traditions of dragon-killers. He has used the same sword ever since any one can remember. It is a beautiful but terrible weapon, made in Pennsylvania, and on its blade is engraved a sort of runic inscription which produces a magical effect on every Republican against whom its edge is turned. The runes have been interpreted to read: "It would be a mistake to set the country by the ears over the tariff question on the eve of a Presidential campaign, and would have the effect of unsettling business."

The latest view of the Philippine situation, as set forth by Secretary Taft last week at St. Louis, is also the most altruistic. We began by expecting to coin money out of the Philippines, and at the same time make the natives happy. When we came to realize that there were no profits in our Oriental venture, we could at least fasten attention on the beatific condition of our wards. But the blunt ex-Governor-General now admits that there is neither gold nor gratitude for us in this business. We should marvel at our own unselfishness. But the reasons for the ingratitude of the Filipinos are satisfying, if ingenious. Since the way to benefit an alien people is to make them as much like ourselves as climate and temperament will permit, therefore we must have American officials "for guidance." In order to make Americans accept these places, we must pay them more than natives doing the same work. Yet in spite of the higher pay we do not always secure men "who are properly imbued with the spirit of sympathy for the natives that is essential to prevent race friction." Thus, out of patronizing comes discrimination, and out of that possible misrule. The facts are no longer in dispute, and allusions to the Philippines not couched in apologetic language have grown rare even in Republican speeches.

It is a rare quarrel in which the causes of disagreement are thoroughly understood before the fighting is over. The question of the Japanese in San Francisco schools was certainly not such a *casus belli*, for Mr. George Kennan has just set forth in the *Outlook* the fundamental facts which ought seemingly to have been known to every one at the beginning. What sympathy the anti-Japanese agitators had in the country at large was obtained by their skilful use of the argument that grown men of alien moral ideas should not be allowed to associate in the schools with young American boys and girls. Going to the records, Mr. Kennan has found that on December 8, 1906, out of 28,736 children in the San Francisco schools, there were just 93 Japanese, of whom 28 were girls. Of the boys only 31 were over fifteen years old, and two over twenty. The number of Japanese over fifteen studying in the primary grades, "beside children of tender age," was exactly six. Even granting their bad influence, which Mr. Kennan denies vigorously, there was evidently no "problem" in San Francisco which the simple establishment of an age limit would not have remedied without friction. Yet supposedly reputable newspapers circulated such statements as that the establishment of a sixteen-year limit for scholars in the primary grades "would eliminate 95 per cent. of the Japanese."

It is said that the Waters-Pierce Oil Company, which was expelled from Texas, readmitted to Texas by the exertions of Senator Bailey, and has now been fined $1,623,900, owns within the State very little property on which the tremendous fine can be levied, even if the verdict holds. Very few of our Trusts clear sixteen hundred thousand dollars in less than twenty-four hours, and many would have to keep at work as much as a week. This is the period of the cumulative penalty. Law-breaking corporations have committed such a staggering number of separate offences that the skilful prosecutor assembles them by hundreds at a time before he goes to court. It is much better than some of the farcical prosecutions of other days, which ended in penalties about adequate to the offence of Sunday ball-playing. The "farmer jury" which sat at Austin had a rare privilege in adding up the penalties for the 2,521 days on which the Texas statutes were violated. But the jury really to be remembered is the one that will some day send to prison a few of the men behind the lawless corporation.

Many will feel that the reversal of the conviction of George Burnham, jr., the first of the indicted New York insurance officials to be sent to prison, will destroy the exemplary value of his prosecution. But the law is the law, and the unanimous opinion of the Appellate Division is that Burnham was not convicted according to criminal law. And be it noted that the errors which Justice Ingraham points out in the conduct of the trial are not unimportant technicalities, but go very near the heart of the matter. If the evidence he specifies was improperly admitted, there can be little doubt that Burnham's case was illegally prejudiced in the minds of the jury. This is not saying, and the Appellate Division does not say, that he should not have been convicted; only that the legal steps were not properly taken. On the new trial which the court orders, he may again be found guilty. It is incumbent on the District Attorney's office to know the law, and to secure convictions which will stand on appeal. Criminal appeal undoubtedly has its abuses in American practice, but no one denies that it ought to exist. Lack of it in England has worked injustice so often that the House of Commons is just now passing a bill to establish for the first time a court of criminal appeal. This is intended to prevent such miscarriages of justice as that in the recent Edalji case. With us, the greater evils have undoubtedly been in the misuse of criminal appeal; yet the thing to do is not to rail at the whole system, but to correct and strengthen it.

Since the year of McKinley's election, the number of inspectors and special agents employed by the Federal Government in its various departments and bureaus has been increased from 160 to more than 3,000. With these figures for his text, Chairman Tawney, of the House Committee on Appropriations, preached a sermon on bureaucracy recently, at Gettysburg, Pa. "The States to-day," he said, "seem not only inclined to allow, but in many instances are anxious voluntarily to surrender, to the Federal Government, the discharge of duties and the exercise of powers reserved by the Constitution to themselves, especially when the exercise of those powers and privileges involves the expenditure of money." It is an impressive list that he read of policies which illustrate this tendency, from the national quarantine law to the Federal investigation of the business methods of private corporations. Yet we fancy that a respectable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

list could be made, by way of rejoinder, of tasks which the States are doing for themselves now, after years of neglecting them. Mr. Tawney himself was accused by the People's Lobby last winter of attempting to weaken the Pure-Food law by an amendment to the Agricultural bill, forbidding the payment of Federal salaries to inspectors already employed by States, counties, or municipalities. It was admitted that the enforcement of the new law would have been almost hopeless, but for the help of State and local machinery already in existence. The enormous increase in Federal activity is quite patent; but more of this is due to work never done at all before than to functions surrendered by the States.

"The Jamestown Exposition ought to be exposed. It is important that the truth in unmeasured terms be told about the monumental failure at Norfolk." Thus writes the *Army and Navy Register* editorially. And it expresses accurately the feeling of both services when it adds: "The army and navy and Marine Corps, including the cadets from Annapolis, are made to do duty as a side-show to an otherwise unattractive, unedifying and uninstructive conglomeration of arrested architecture and placarded vacancy." The *Army and Navy Journal* has also protested, not vigorously enough, however, to please a naval correspondent, who writes to its editor: "Your editorial on the Jamestown fizzle was defective only where you hesitated to tell the whole truth. There never was a more dismal failure than this thing. What angered our officers and made us blush for our country was the manifest intent of using not only our navy, but all visiting ships, as an advertising scheme to exploit a gang of greedy money-makers." But that is all that there has been to the Exposition from the start—this desire to make money out of the American army and navy, and even the President of the United States. From New York to Washington the fields are disfigured by Exposition signs bearing the pictures of a soldier and a sailor—but no reference to anything else.

President Eliot has had the hardihood to point out that Harvard's non-success in athletics has in no wise interfered with her growth, or her high position in the estimation of those parents who choose a university for its educational opportunities. There is Johns Hopkins at Baltimore, one of our most useful institutions. Few know or care whether it has a baseball nine or football eleven. It really has them, and a lacrosse team as well. But no one would think of travelling to Baltimore to see a game between Johns Hopkins and Harvard, if they should chance to meet. Yet the former continues to graduate excellent doctors of medicine and exceptionally well-trained students, whose object is to acquire knowledge while at Baltimore, rather than be amused by intercollegiate games. President Eliot also spoke out sharply against the professional coach. Harvard has yielded to the undergraduate demand for professional coaches in the hope of ending her long series of defeats on the water. She triumphed over Yale last year, but has already been beaten by Columbia and Cornell in this season. Not even professional coaches will, we believe, assure Harvard a full share of victories, so long as studies there are valued more than sports, and the men are not willing to make the sacrifices demanded by athletics.

At the commencement exercises of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Dr. Cyrus Adler proposed last Sunday the establishment of a Hebrew university. This, it was explained, would include all the leading Hebrew institutions of learning, which thus, instead of being rivals, would coöperate for a common end. The plan is to found a university after the German model, with the already existing theological school as one of the faculties. So far as endowment is concerned, the large number of wealthy and intelligent Hebrews who take a deep interest in education would assure the success of the undertaking. As for the teaching staff, the supply of learned Jews resident in America is practically unlimited. To many, however, Christians as well as Israelites, it would be a cause of regret that unnecessary emphasis should be laid upon race differences. The Jews have done a great deal for American education, in scholarship as well as in endowments. To Columbia, for example, they have been most generous. Several Jewish scholars of distinction are on the faculty, and among the graduates are to be numbered some of the most intellectual and progressive rabbis. At several other universities the race is honorably represented; hence the establishment of a distinctively Hebrew university would seem to be unnecessary.

The time having apparently come when neither belief nor authority suffices to keep the denominational sheep within the fold, new expedients are in order. Of all these we have seen none more inviting than the proposals of the Rev. A. V. G. Allen in his recent volume, "Freedom in the Church." His purpose is to show that, the articles of the creed having been adopted at different epochs and variously interpreted by different theologians of equal authority, there need be no uniformity among those who subscribe to it. He even waxes scornful at the "man in the street" who presumes to have an opinion on matters theological, or to criticise clergymen. So, too, Dr. Allen is indignant at the idea that when a church calls a minister it has a right to hold him accountable for the creed which he professes. "Honesty in the recitation of the creed is by no means the only question. Deeper motives lie beneath the present disturbance than can be measured by the uncritical observer." Dr. Allen writes his treatise with such skill that it is difficult to see how any churchman cannot find in it precedents for believing anything he chooses. Nevertheless, as if he feared that he had left some loophole by which somebody might indulge in the mild exhilaration of heresy, he says, at the end: "There is a rubric of the English book before all the creeds—Apostles', Nicene, or Athanasian—that they may be 'sung or said.' . . . If they are sung, they pass into the rank of the great hymns, the Te Deum and the Gloria in Excelsis, where misunderstandings disappear." Here, at last, is the heresy-ridder and doubt-dispeller for which troubled theologians have long been praying! Dr. Holmes commended silence as a poultice to heal the blows of sound: Dr. Allen's specific is a song to heal the discords of speech. If your Unitarian has trouble in accepting the Trinity, politely request him to sing those clauses of the creed, and you will make a Trinitarian of him at once. Agnostics, Turks, and other infidels can be brought in this way to a rapid and painless conversion.

In the cruel war that has been raging among nature-lovers we suggest that the animal psychologists would do well to enlist the services of their natural allies, the child psychologists—especially such as are capable of producing stories like "The Apple of Discord," in the May *Century*. It is about a small boy, who, having seen his father appropriate and devour an apple at the grocery, proceeds himself to steal a box of candy. Result: Mother, heart-broken; father, horrified; small boy, much depressed; perplexed as to what it is all about; also, noncommittal. The stern father decides to dress the boy up as a little girl, in order properly to humiliate him, take him to the grocery, and make him beg the forgiveness of the proprietor. This the boy, now also heart-broken, but still both puzzled and dumb, does; and incidentally whispers in the grocer's ear a tearful plea that his father shall not be put in jail because he stole the apple. *Dénouement:* Father gets down on his knees to small boy, calls him his "little man-child," and otherwise wallows naked in gush. There is a clear similarity between this kind of child psychology and the animal psychology which gets its portrayers elected to the Ananias Club. For example, Mr. Roberts has a story ("The Decoy") about a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wild goose, which a hunter had crippled by breaking its wing, and then tethered in a pond as a stool for other geese. The innocent decoy played his part perfectly until he discovered what it really was, and then struck, righteously refusing to perpetrate the base and murderous deception upon his fellow-geese. So far as we are aware, the boy has not been identified; but Mr. Roberts declares that the goose story is true, and intimates that he knew this particular goose personally. At any rate, we maintain that the respective biographers of the boy and the goose could fight with good heart, and, if need be, die, under the same banner.

That the English Government would drop incontinently the Irish Council bill, after the Irish themselves had spurned it, was foregone. The Prime Minister's announcement to that effect in the Commons Monday, simply shows that the Irish, who went in for a policy of all or nothing, will get nothing. Even the Irish university scheme will be abandoned for the present. This is really a severe blow to Irish hopes. Mr. Balfour has long favored the creation of a great Irish university, to respond to national aspirations; Mr. Bryce, while Chief Secretary, warmly espoused the plan; and it looked as if the large work might be undertaken in a conciliatory spirit. But the impatient Irish have now upset the apple-cart, and spilled out the university along with the Irish Council. Of course, the result is disheartening to Liberals, who have troubles enough of their own. In Campbell-Bannerman's statement Monday there was little that is either aggressive or hopeful. This year, there is to be no autumn session; the party has no stomach for a long fight of that kind. Consequently, a whole series of bills must be jettisoned. The Premier declared that he would bring in, before the month ends, a "resolution" on the subject of the House of Lords; but unless the Liberals manage to get a taking issue against the upper chamber, they may "resoloot till the cows come home" without producing any result except laughter in the Lords and cynical outbursts from Balfour. All told, the Liberal prospect is clouded. A sweeping measure of land reform may improve the outlook; but the chances seem good for slow disintegration of the Liberal majority, with steady loss of prestige.

Shortly before its adjournment, the Reichstag received from the Chancellor a full statement of all the cases of official misconduct in the German colonies, or at least all of those which have attracted public attention. All told, there are twenty-seven cases recorded for the last seventeen years. In that period, more than 2,000 military and other officers have been on duty in the colonies. In these twenty-seven cases there were only five which resulted in criminal court proceedings, and in four of them there was a conviction. In all the other instances, except nine, disciplinary measures were taken by the Government or courts-martial, and in one of these nine death saved the offender. On its face, in view of climatic conditions and the well-known demoralizing effect of life in the tropics, the Government feels that this record is very creditable. And so it would be if one could be sure that it really included all the wrong-doers. How many such escaped publicity or resigned in time, no one can estimate. Moreover, the name of a single offender may mean hundreds, if not thousands, of petty wrongs and tyrannies. There was the case of Prince Arenberg, for instance; he committed several murders and was guilty of a number of frightful cruelties. He was tried, but was acquitted on the ground of insanity, and is now spending his time in a luxurious insane asylum. The public expects at any date to hear of his discharge as "cured." On the whole, there is no special reason for satisfaction in this roll-call of the guilty or the accused.

Kaiser Wilhelm adds to his many other accomplishments skill as an artist and art critic. In a book just published in Berlin, Professor Seidel, curator of art in the royal palaces, praises the sovereign's activity in "church architecture, forestry, landscape gardening, genre painting, stage decoration, and the applied arts." If he indeed is proficient in all those branches, it can readily be understood that he has no time, even if he had the inclination, to disturb the peace of Europe. As a critic, his taste is catholic, although at times he is severe in his judgments. While he has no prejudice against impressionists, he "hates still life and uninteresting subjects which lack movement." His opinions are given at random, sometimes in the form of marginal notes. When some South German amateurs undertook to decide what kind of monument should be erected for Wagner in Berlin, the Kaiser signified his displeasure by writing "nonsense" at the end of one of the articles. Not even a Winckelmann could have expressed an æsthetic opinion more concisely and forcibly. But, if the royal connoisseur wishes to cure any German artists of the still-life painting habit, he might send them over to Washington for a brief visit.

A Lisbon dispatch last week spoke of the introduction of an absolutist régime in Portugal following upon the dissolution of the Cortes without any date set for new elections. A royal decree has been issued "granting subsidies and increasing the salaries of civil servants," and King Carlos is said "to visit the military barracks daily." All this evidently scents the fear of revolution. In fact, the republican propaganda in the kingdom has been for some time active enough to give justification for the gravest fears. We had brief notice some time ago of an unsuccessful revolt among the officers of the fleet, having for its object the overthrow of the monarchy. The present crisis began with disorders at the university of Coimbra, culminating in the wholesale secession of the student body to Lisbon, where their arrival supplied an impetus to the republican agitation. The question was brought up in the Cortes, and the Liberal-Conservative Government found itself blocked by the obstructionist tactics of the Progressist minority. Thereupon the Chambers were dissolved, and the University of Coimbra, the Technical College, and other higher institutions of learning, were closed. Inasmuch as the Chambers were dissolved before the budget for the year 1906-07 had been approved, the Government is now acting in direct contravention of the Constitution, which forbids the maintenance of more than one provisional budget. To win the support of the masses from the republican movement, the Government announced a series of concessions—an increase of salary for State employees, tariff reduction, a law upon viticulture, and an old-age pension law—of which the grants mentioned in this recent dispatch are evidently the first to be put in force.

"The sea-serpent of diplomatic reports" is the name that has been given to the project of building a railway from Constantinople to Bagdad. But the plans are now perfected, and, it is confidently predicted, will be carried out. The Germans obtained from the Sultan in 1902 a grant of the proposed line for ninety-nine years. When completed, the road will put Constantinople into communication with the Indian Ocean, by a route far shorter than any other, and which may rival the Suez Canal as a way to certain parts of the Orient. The engineering difficulties are great, but the new railway will accomplish the military unity of the Ottoman Empire, and will develop a country rich in agriculture as well as in coal and petroleum. M. Dubief, writing in the *Revue Bleue*, attributes the success of Germany in this enterprise to the popularity of the Emperor at Constantinople. When all other European Powers were exacting in their demands upon the Porte, the Emperor stood aloof. M. Dubief, while admitting that France is disappointed, thinks there will necessarily be great publicity in an undertaking so important to European interests.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT'S "PRACTICAL" SPEECH.

It has been said of the Bible: "This is the book where each his doctrine seeks, and this the book where each his doctrine finds." In this respect, however, the Bible must yield the palm to President Roosevelt's speeches. They are probably the finest examples of the wedding of opposites, and the vehement assertion of contradictories, ever penned by man. The result is that each reader finds in them what he desires to find. Another result is that they are subject to the most conflicting interpretation. Thus, the views taken by the leading newspapers of his Indianapolis speech, last Thursday, differ radically. In one we discover that the President is "aggressive"; in another that he is "reassuring." Here we learn that he is planning new and terrible attacks upon the railways; there we discover that he has taken fright at the consequences of his policy, and has abandoned it. These diverse and even irreconcilable impressions, made by a single speech, may show that Mr. Roosevelt is myriad-minded, or that he is unstable-minded; but they illustrate his method. There was never his equal for ability, in one and the same address, to dispute on either side, confute, change hands, and still confute.

Still, in our judgment, there is no mistaking the President's main drift. On his course, he tacks with bewildering frequency, and appears to be going in all directions; but, on the whole, it is clear that he is trimming his sails to the prevailing wind, and does not mean to battle with the strong tide now running. In a word, as one who classed himself with Harriman as a "practical" man, as a confessed political opportunist, Mr. Roosevelt has found that the times call for caution and moderation, and accordingly he is trying to appear cautious and moderate. He perceives that there is widespread financial uneasiness, and he endeavors to apply palliatives. With a threatened crop-shortage, he feels that the public is in no mood for rash experiment, and so he suddenly blossoms out as a conservative. In what he says about the crying need of railway enlargement, with its demand for private capital; and in pointing out that this private capital cannot be had without the prospect of a reasonable return and protection from Socialistic legislation, he makes himself almost a verbal echo of Hill, Harriman, and other railway presidents. He no longer finds, as he did in his annual message last December, that the predictions of trouble in railway financing are "amusing." They are now a sobering reality, and the President shows that he has been made anxious by it.

The net effect of the President's speech is that the times have changed, and that Theodore Roosevelt has changed with them. Of course, he is valiant in affirming that his purpose is "unalterable"; and asserts that he says now only what he has "always" said. But always is as dangerous a word for a politician as never. What are the facts? The President now declares that there has been "much wild talk" about the over-capitalization of American railways. In his opinion, there is practically no over-capitalization, since the "real value" of the railway properties is, he thinks, greater than the "face value" of their securities. But in his message last year, he spoke of "the evils of excessive over-capitalization," as if they were admitted by all; while in 1905 he mentioned over-capitalization as "perhaps the chief" of all the "abuses" which he aimed to correct. A man may change his mind when he finds that he did not know what the facts were; but it is not even a skilful manœuvre to cover a retreat, when the command for about-face is given, with the words: "All this is what I have said over and over again."

In some quarters there appears to be much excitement over an *obiter* in the President's speech. In a casual way, he said:

> In so far as the common carriers also transport the mails, it is in my opinion probable that whether their business is or is not interstate, it is to the same extent subject to Federal control, under that clause of the Constitution granting to the national Government power to establish post roads, and therefore, by necessary implication, power to take all action necessary in order to keep them at the highest point of efficiency.

This is held up as a new scheme of Mr. Roosevelt's to break down the power of the States, and to put the Federal Government in direct charge of every street-car carrying mails. It is pictured as an alarming hint of the kind of seizure of power "by construction," to the possibility of which Secretary Root referred in his much-discussed speech, some months ago. But we do not think anything of the kind will be really attempted. We have no idea that, if it were, it could be done. The disquieting thing about the President's lugging in of such extraneous matter is that it indicates a certain flightiness. A well-balanced statesman would not venture to throw out so dubious a suggestion in a public speech. He would weigh the thing carefully; take advice; consult lawyers and judges; and even then would not be so cocksure. But what Mr. Roosevelt thinks about he talks about; his half-formed ideas he blurts out, feeling that because they interest him, they must other people. This "thinking out loud," as Mr. Root called it, is an old habit of the President's; but it surely was never displayed to so little advantage as in this jaunty, and wholly unnecessary offering of a judicial opinion in favor of a very strained interpretation of the Constitution.

In the main, however, it is clear that the President intended to allay the apprehensions which he has excited. The many appeals to him to say something to soothe the feelings of capitalists have their answer in this speech. It amounts to saying: "If you thought I wanted financial trouble during my Administration, or that I did not know how disastrous would be its political effects; if you thought I was fanatically convinced, like Bryan, instead of being merely bent on the advantage of the hour, you now see how greatly you were mistaken."

THE NATIONAL GUARD INQUIRY.

The investigating committee appointed by the New York Legislature to study conditions in the National Guard has practically unlimited powers. If our understanding is correct, it can inquire whether Private John Smith has been doing his duty, or whether the humblest employee in a Buffalo armory is being overpaid. So broad is the scope of its investigation that it is highly important that its members should fully realize the extent of their opportunity. Of their peculiar fitness for the task in hand we have full assurance; it is hard to see how the personnel could have been bettered. But they understand, we hope, that they would fall far short of public expectation if they should confine their investigation to the question of armory graft, or to the relations between the Adjutant-General and Major-General Commanding. Theirs is the chance to do a solid piece of constructive work—to lay, perhaps, the foundation for reorganization, and to influence Federal and State legislation for years to come. For whatever is done by them is certain to be imitated in many other places.

A perception of the unusual character of the inquiry was shown by a member of the Commission, who remarked that there was actually no precedent in this country for its proceedings, and that it could only be likened to Lord Usher's recent committee on the British auxiliary forces. The truth is that our National Guard system has developed in a purely haphazard way; its very name is a misnomer, and the functions and duties of the State troops in war time have long engaged the attention of our greatest Constitutional authorities. For about a hundred years Congress paid practically no attention to the militia; after the war with Spain it passed the Dick law, the object of which was to bring the State troops into close relations with the War Department, and make them of immediate avail in time of war with a foreign enemy. During the long period between the civil and Spanish wars, the National Guard improved steadily, if slowly, always fol-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowing in the footsteps of the regular army to the extent, at least, of imitating its numerous uniform changes. The number of troops was cut down; paper regiments were done away with, the encampment periods lengthened, and practical field exercises introduced. In short, the fuss and feathers of the old militia training days have gradually disappeared, particularly in this State.

On account of the changed attitude of the Federal Government towards the State troops, the Sanger Commission, as we presume it will be called after its able chairman, will find, if it goes deep enough, two prevailing schools of thought. One, backed by all the influence of the Federal Government, is for making the National Guard merely a reserve for the regular army; the other remembers that these are State troops, primarily maintained for the purpose of preserving law and order within our State boundaries, or at most performing similar duty elsewhere at the call of the President, as did the Seventh Regiment in Washington in 1861. The present commander of the State troops, Gen. Roe, represents, it seems to us, the State idea. He is much less interested in making a poor reserve than in creating a body of civilian soldiery peculiarly efficient in such duties as they were called upon to perform at Buffalo, in Brooklyn, and at Croton, when summoned for strike duty. He cares nothing for brigade exercises or division manœuvres; he does lay great stress upon the efficiency of each unit, and he desires more cavalry and less artillery, for the former is of the greatest value in riots, and the latter of very little save in great emergencies.

Whether the Sanger Commission can reconcile these two theories remains to be seen. For ourselves, we sincerely hope that the State idea will remain uppermost, if for no other reason because we believe that an effective reserve to the regular army can be built up only on totally different lines. Recruiting the militia is difficult enough; there are very few attractions for the ordinary enlisted man. If the Federal idea is to prevail, and the physical standards of the regular army, recruiting will be difficult indeed, and the State will lose the services of some of its ablest young citizens for minor physical defects of no importance in National Guard service. Already there is grave anxiety as to the effects of the Dick law, which finally comes into force on January first next, and which insists, for instance, that each company must have only eighty-four men, though many of our companies have a hundred. Failure to comply with the law is punished by the withdrawal of Federal financial support. How troops in North Carolina and South Dakota are going to comply with the law—to say nothing of New York—remains to be seen.

So far as local military problems are concerned, there are plenty of them for the Sanger commission to consider. It ought to recommend the ending of the election of company officers by their men, and of field officers by their subordinates—a practice excusable, perhaps, in 1807, but, in 1907, at the bottom of endless regimental quarrels and dissensions, and responsible for much laxity of discipline. It might well decide that the offices of adjutant-general and major-general commanding should be consolidated, or that we should make experiment of a chief of staff and an adjutant-general. The Commission must not overlook the fact that the cities build the armories and the State controls them; the Legislature often making laws about them at the behest of politicians, in flagrant disregard of the wishes of the military authorities. It will find that there is no systematic instruction of officers, and that the proportion of infantry to cavalry and artillery is in need of adjustment. Finally, if it is candid, it will report that the attempt to make valuable coast artillery out of militia troops is hopeless.

KARL BLIND AND HIS TIME.

The death in London of Karl Blind at the advanced age of eighty-one removes the last of the notable figures of the German revolution of 1848-49. Kinkel, Hecker, Hartmann, Schurz, Mieroslawski, Bamberger, Freiligrath, Willich, Karl Marx Sigel, Blenker, Kapp—a whole host of others of greater or smaller fame, have passed away, enthusiastic believers in liberty and democratic institutions to the end. Here and there still survive men who as mere boys took part in what was as pure and idealistic an uprising as any country ever witnessed. But of the leaders that have now gone, none held out against the Prussian monarchy and the Imperial government more obstinately than Karl Blind. He never returned to Germany; but political events there he watched with as keen an eye at eighty as at twenty, and his comments on them in the English magazines were invariably illuminating.

Reviewed now, Blind's career reads more like a romance than an historical record. Educated at the Universities of Heidelberg and Bonn, he was five times imprisoned, because of his political views, between his nineteenth and twenty-first birthdays. Captured at the battle of Staufen, he was court-martialed and saved from death only by a flaw in a proclamation of the Grand Duke of Baden. Eight months' solitary confinement, at first in chains, followed; then another uprising of the people freed him in time to become a member of the revolutionary government; and later its minister to France. There he was again arrested, in violation of the law of nations, but after two months in jail was merely banished. By that time most of the South German exiles had found a refuge in London or in Switzerland, and from the home Blind established in the British capital he coöperated with Mazzini, Garibaldi, Ledru-Rollin, Louis Blanc, and other European leaders; for the revolutionary movement of that day knew no national boundaries among its advocates. The Schleswig-Holstein movement he naturally aided, likewise the Polish uprising of 1863-64 against Russia. The American civil war left him not a moment in doubt; his sympathies went out at once to Schurz, Sigel, Hecker, Blenker, and Willich, who were so quick to don the Federal uniform in behalf of the enslaved African. In short, wherever men thought or battled for freedom and against despotism, Karl Blind worked for them and cheered them on.

In Carl Schurz's recently published reminiscences, in *McClure's Magazine*, the spirit which actuated the "48-ers," as they are still known throughout Germany, has been well described. The names of Franklin and Washington were lode-stars by which they sought to steer their course. At the great *Demokratenfest* in Mayence, on February 24, 1849—a bold celebration of democratic beliefs and an avowal of faith in republics and their underlying theories—the world-wide character of the revolution was clearly recognized. Fröbel himself toasted "the revolution, which includes all European peoples, which brings nourishment to the starving Irish in the West, and loosens the chains of the serfs in the Ural, which makes in the south citizens of the *lazzaroni*, and brings the conception of liberty to the North." Yet an easy victory was nowhere expected. Ludwig Bamberger on this same occasion said boldly: "We cannot triumph now. An ocean of tears of blood still lies between us and the new land of freedom." When the ill-armed forces of the people were scattered like chaff by the Prussian troops, it was but natural that the majority of the leaders who survived should have sought freedom on this side of the Atlantic, little dreaming that within twelve years they should again be taking up arms for their belief that all men are free and equal.

History has not yet fully set forth the value of the services rendered by these men to the Union. It is not merely that every German regiment that went to the front had one or more of them among its officers; that Hecker, the most prominent of all the revolutionary leaders of 1848-49, commanded the Eighty-second Illinois and Willich the Thirty-second Indiana, and that Schurz, Sigel, Blenker, Steinwehr, and others were general officers. More weighty than this was the worth of their example, the lofty patriotism they displayed, their devo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion to the republic and all it stood for, their readiness to pay their debt of gratitude with their lives after only ten or eleven years of residence. They were not soldiers of fortune, but men of conscience, and as such their prompt response to the call for aid was of immense moral value to the Washington Government. In this day and generation, when the tendency is to restrict more and more the immigration of foreigners, this debt of the United States to some of its immigrants cannot be recalled too often.

What the loss of such men as Blind and Schurz meant to Germany, even Bismarck was able to see, and he expressed his regret at it more than once. Bamberger remained in Germany, and as a Liberal member of the Reichstag rendered services of great value, fighting always for the doctrines of his youth. Had there been more like him, it is at least questionable whether the democratic movement would have been so completely pushed aside by the Socialistic as is the case in Germany to-day. Somehow or other, if there is to be real progress there and elsewhere in Europe, there must be a revival of the moral enthusiasm and the idealism of Karl Blind's time. In their recurrence, we believe, his faith no more faltered than did that of Schurz. He who drinks as a young man such draughts from the cup of liberty as did they, never wholly loses the effect of the stimulant. And Blind lived long enough to see the first trial of popular suffrage in Austria, to witness the people of Russia stirring mightily, quickening to the old-fashioned doctrines of a popular parliament, and no taxation without representation. This surely must have revived his faith, had it failed him in view of the absence of any Republican movement in Germany, as it must hearten every true believer in democracy the world over.

WHEN HOMER NODS.

An English newspaper, in commenting on Mr. Bryce's recent speech at Jamestown, called attention to an erroneous statement therein which it thought might be due to a blunder in telegraphic transmission, but in any case curious enough to be made a text for commenting on mistakes made by men who know much better. Mr. Bryce was reported as saying that in 1607 "Sir Walter Raleigh was a man of fifty-five; Sir Philip Sidney was a man of forty-nine; Pym a youth of seventeen; Hampden a boy of seven; Cromwell a boy of eight." Whereupon the English journal remarks that "it is scarcely conceivable that any one could forget the circumstances of Sidney's heroic death at Zutphen more than twenty years earlier, or could include him among the eminent figures of the court of James I." But there are excellent precedents for the blunder, if it actually was made. One explanation lies in the existence of what has been called an "idiotic area" in the brain corresponding to the "blind spot" in the eye, which renders one strangely insensible not only to slips of the tongue, but to glaring errors in manuscript and proof.

Guy de Maupassant, in his introduction to the works of Gustave Flaubert, quotes extensively from a huge scrapbook of bulls, errors, sillinesses, and crudities which the latter had passed many years in compiling from the writings and speeches of the great men of all times. It was not mere pastime for Flaubert, but a serious documentation for the study of irony. Having shown the illusory nature of passion in "Madame Bovary," of political power in "Salâmmbo," of faith in "La Tentation de Saint Antoine," of civic peace in "Bouvard et Pécuchet," and of civic training in "L'Education sentimentale," he took delight in heaping up a monument of testimony to the weakness and treachery of the human intellect itself. Flaubert pursued the scholastic method of quotation and comment; of the scores of examples that his pupil quotes we may take one as typical. A distinguished writer of the classicist school had been elected to the Academy, and in his inaugural address argued for the thesis that literature should not concern itself with the sensational event of the moment. Flaubert quotes his words: "Did Molière, did Corneille, find it necessary to put on the stage the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes?" and comments, "Molière died 1673; Corneille died 1684; Edict of Nantes revoked 1685."

"It is scarcely conceivable that any one could forget the circumstances of Sidney's heroic death at Zutphen." That is just the point. The youngest of us knew very well the story of Sidney, wounded to death, removing the bottle of water from his parched lips to hand it to a dying soldier. Not only that, but Mr. Bryce probably knew just how much credence should be lent to Fulke Greville's account of the incident, and could point out passages in the "Arcadia" laudatory of just such acts of chivalry. But is there anything novel about the investigator of the theory of pure number who cannot subtract with acceptable accuracy, or the Shakespearean scholar who cannot remember the name of Hamlet's uncle, or the writer on rhetoric who trips up on the spelling of "queue"? Authors can never be depended upon to read their proofs well, for the reason that in the parts they are fond of, emotion, plus vivid memory, makes them blind; while in the parts they are deadly tired of, indifference makes them equally blind.

Psychologists have studied and tabulated the whimsicalities of the "idiotic area" which makes us not only blind, but deaf and halt. The specialist in palæography, proceeding on recognized principles, can thus confidently go on correcting the mistakes of some scribe of a thousand years ago who wrote *nobis* when he should have written *vobis*, because *nobis* came on the preceding line, or put "Aetius" for "Stilicho" for the same reason. There are errors of transcription which occur with regularity and have been classified under such formidable heads as haplography, dittography, etc. Poe heard the whispered word Lenore because he was quite ready to hear it, just as children and visitors at spiritualist *séances* see ghosts, and German metaphysicians, in moments of intense abstraction, drink vinegar for water and find it good.

All writers who create large galleries of portraits occasionally mix them up; or if they write long novels, forget towards the end what came at the beginning. Balzac, if we are not mistaken, is guilty of writing Rastignac when he meant De Marsay, and Thackeray was continually confounding his Philips, Pendennises, and Warringtons. Sir Walter Scott had it called to his attention by his printer that it was wrong to say "the cutler replied," because he had made that person go downstairs some time before; and corrected his proofs to read, "the cutler, who had in the meanwhile reëntered the room, replied." It was Mark Twain's bitter complaint against James Fenimore Cooper that he permitted a ninety-foot houseboat descending the Susquehanna River to take curves fifty feet in length.

THE SKIRTS OF FAME.

If we may judge of the bulk of Mark Twain's half-million-word autobiography from the parts that are appearing in the *North American Review*, the name of Susan Clemens is destined to some share of the immortality that awaits Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn. The extracts from "Susy's Biography of Me" are quite as gripping and illuminative as anything in the great philosopher's ripe recollections of himself. Unless, indeed, the paternal hand has added its own touch to the material, Susan had her full portion of the hereditary humor and power of insight, and her contributions to the autobiography are sufficient to give her complete title to the rank of collaborator. On the other hand, Mark Twain's fourteen-year-old daughter, on whose memory he continually dwells with such poignant regret, could have found no more acceptable editor and publisher than her father, who has opened his pages to her as freely as the pages of the world's books and magazines are open to him.

Very few of us are in the happy position of being able to raise a monument more lasting than brass to the memory of some unknown dead, or to bring fame

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the deserving and living obscure; and those who are in the position to confer fame, by virtue of a safe and commanding place in the world of letters or art, carefully abstain from doing so. The literary professional is so much of a parasite on other people's thoughts and phrases that he dare not name his victims under penalty of dimming his own reputation. The historian's fair name does not suffer because in his footnotes he assigns credit where it is due. But how many essayists would be courageous enough to state in parentheses, "This brilliant observation was made one day by Mr. Jones, a very dear friend, who has given me permission to make whatever use of it I choose," or, "This point was suggested at dinner one evening by Mr. Smith, whose engagements in Wall Street do not allow him sufficient leisure for personally developing his very incisive views on the Spanish drama." What novelist would venture to confess at the end of a chapter that "the dramatic situation on pages 44-48 is largely the work of a kindly critic and companion, Miss Robinson, who, on seeing the original manuscript, suggested that, instead of making Venango kill Gaspard, I should have Gaspard kill Venango." Now and then a particularly conscientious author will write, "Some one has cleverly said," or, "I have read in a book that I have since forgotten——" Forgotten; some one! There is the rankest denial of justice to one whose claims to a share of the author's reputation any court would allow.

It is not so much the man or woman who occasionally utters something worthy to be perpetuated that has reason to complain. There are undoubtedly thousands of potential authors in this country at the present who are silent because of some form of literary agraphia—laziness, lack of the power of concentration, or horror of the pen. People who will talk brilliantly at dinner or discourse on deep themes during a walk in the country, fall into a cold sweat when you ask them why they do not occasionally write down the things they "get off" with such apparent ease. And their horror of the pen proceeds from a superstitious reverence which is ridiculously widespread. What! Actually see one's self in print? At the very idea of giving written form to their daily thought, that thought grows palsied with mistaken humility, with actual cowardice. "You take it and write it up"—"you" being a professional literary chap—pleads the victim; and the literary carpenter makes no bones about accepting the offer and posing as a source of inspiration and germinating bed of ideas, whereas he is only a clearing-house. Our mute, inglorious Miltons are not silent because they cannot spell correctly, but partly because they would rather play golf, and partly because they don't understand that the making of much of literature is like the making of chairs—dictated by the necessity of earning a living.

And yet, if the professional writer would but get to see it, the adoption of some such system of giving a due meed of fame to those who cannot conquer it for themselves, would immeasurably enhance the author's position. The man whose book commands attention would be welcome in every house, not as a mere celebrity to flaunt in the eyes of our neighbors, but as one in whose power it is to raise whom he will, by a kindly allusion, a sympathetic foot-note, or well-turned dedication, from the level of the street to Olympus. If Homer, in exchange for a flagon of wine and a side of roast sheep, endowed his host with immortality by placing his ancestors among the heroes who came to Troy; if Dante did not think it beneath him to insert the name of his benefactor, Can Grande, into the text of his immortal poem, it surely would be no disgrace for one of our moderns to go a step farther, and, after mentioning his friends' or his patrons' palaces, yachts, stocks and bonds, automobiles, and ancestors, perpetuate even a remark or two made by his host or hostess at a moment of inspiration.

The world at large would surely profit by having such minor accretions of merit embedded and preserved in the larger fame of those whose business it is to write. It raises the general estimation of human progress to think that for every book we have in print, ten authors thought and felt and aspired. How many charming people have we not come to know, because they wrote letters to Robert Louis Stevenson or Balzac? How many an old historian would have been lost to us, as a man, if Cyprian or Jerome, in quoting his fragments, had referred to him as "some lost Pagan"? What would lovers of all subsequent ages have done if Longinus had spoken of "a certain lady writer from the island of Lesbos," instead of Sappho?

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON DEFOE.—I.

I desire in these notes to analyze, in the light of some recent investigations, the more or less standard list of Defoe's writings prefixed to the first volume of William Lee's well-known work, and also, despite the fact that Defoe is already enrolled among the most voluminous and versatile of all British writers, to point out a rather large number of items, chiefly pamphlets, which in my judgment should be definitely ascribed to him. I wish furthermore to enlist the interest of bibliographers and collectors and students of the period in order that I may profit from their corrections and suggestions before I publish in approximately final form the bibliography I am preparing; and to secure, if possible, through their assistance access to a number of rare items, that have thus far eluded me.

Before entering definitely upon my task, I may say that, as often happens, I began only with the intention of dipping into the subject, soon found myself getting deeper and deeper in, and at last was completely over my head. If there now seems to be some chance of my emerging, this is due to the fact that I have been able to use freely many of the largest libraries in this country—particularly that of Yale University—as well as the Bodleian and the British Museum, and that I have received invaluable aid from scholars and collectors—especially from George A. Aitken, Thomas J. Wise, and Prof. H. S. Foxwell, who generously lent me manuscript lists of ascriptions and gave me access to many rare tracts. Numerous memoranda made by the late James Crossley were put at my disposal by Mr. Aitken, and fully half of the additions I shall propose are due to suggestions found in these papers. The remainder of my proposed additions fall chiefly under three heads: (a) pamphlets read without previous suspicion of Defoe's authorship, and found through stylistic analysis and the following out of a variety of clues and tests to be indisputably or most probably his; (b) tracts ascribed to Defoe in the catalogues of libraries, yet either overlooked or discarded by Lee; (c) pamphlets laid at Defoe's door by contemporaries such as Boyer and Toland, but rejected by Defoe's biographers on the score of his own disclaimers or of lack of consistency with his acknowledged or well ascertained writings.

In the case of the last-named group my acceptance of items usually discarded has been due to the fact that I have been forced against my will to come to the conclusion that Defoe stuck at nothing when he wished to evade a charge of authorship, and that he was quite capable, as his enemies asserted, of writing on both sides of any question. For about two years I preserved some of my faith in the Defoe of the biographers—the veracious and consistent and high-minded writer on public affairs, and I could have preserved a modicum of confidence to the end had it been only a question of resisting the evidence of his duplicity afforded by a few pamphlets not absolutely proved to be his. But when the application of numerous and very minute tests—which cannot be described here—invariably brought me over to the side of the contemporaries who attributed the tracts in question to Defoe—to the number, let us say, of fifteen or twenty—and when, without expecting it at all, I was led by these same tests to attribute to him new tracts plainly written to uphold causes and men he had shortly before denounced, my belief in his integrity was shattered, and I regretfully yielded to the conviction that his journalistic rivals knew his character and his ways far better than any of his biographers. I came to the conclusion also that the tradition that he had been known on occasions to write two rather long pamphlets in one day, was not a gross exaggeration. This tradition and the fact that most of the items I wish to add are tracts, few of them of any considerable length, should be borne in mind by persons disposed to doubt whether it is possible to supplement so extensively at this late day the bibliography of a writer so important and so much studied as Defoe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is scarcely necessary to add that I take no stock whatsoever in the notion that Defoe had a "double," who wrote in a style practically indistinguishable from his. To champion the existence of such a "double" is to set up an hypothesis no more explicable and certainly less credible than the phenomenal creative activity which has been a stumbling-block to comparatively sterile mortals.

But it is time to turn to Lee's "Chronological Catalogue," given in his "Daniel Defoe: His Life and Recently Discovered Writings" (1869). This "Catalogue" has been made the basis of practically all subsequent work upon Defoe—for example, of Minto's short biography in the "English Men of Letters," of Leslie Stephen's article in the "Dictionary of National Biography," and of the critical portions and the bibliography of Thomas Wright's "Life of Daniel Defoe" (1894). It contained 254 items, and included not only the separate volumes of the *Review*, but also all the other journals with which Defoe could be shown to have been connected, as well as the works to which he made contributions. The first item, "A Letter containing some Reflections, etc." (1687), was later admitted by Lee to be Bishop Burnet's. The gap is filled, however, by Lee's accidental omission of "Due Preparations for the Plague" (1722), and the list is extended by the fact that Lee concurred with Crossley and others in attributing to Defoe the tract entitled "A brief historical Account of the Lives of the six notorious Street Robbers, etc." (1726), which is included in the sixteenth volume of George A. Aitken's edition of Defoe's "Romances and Narratives" (1895). Another item would have been added by Lee had he lived until 1895, when Dr. Bülbring published the tract "Of Royall Education," which he had separated from "The Compleat English Gentleman," edited by him in 1890. We may therefore regard the standard list of Defoe's writings, exclusive of his letters (many of which were published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in 1897 and 1899), and of such papers as the interesting document given in *The English Historical Review* for January, 1907, as consisting of 256 items. From these, for my present purposes, I subtract twenty-three items, covering all those that do not refer to books or pamphlets,* which leaves 233 books and pamphlets for consideration here. Of these, I have read in one form or another, all except three items, which, fortunately, are not supported by Lee's attribution alone. They are:

No. 47. "The Liberty of Episcopal Dissenters in Scotland truly Stated. By a Gentleman." 4to, 1703.

No. 53. "The Layman's Sermon upon the late Storm, etc." 4to, 1704; and

No. 234. "Mere Nature Delineated; or a Body without a Soul, etc." 8vo, 1726.

These all appear in Walter Wilson's list (though he had not seen the first), and the first and last were accepted by Hazlitt. I am quite certain that the last is by Defoe, for reasons that need not be given; but I should be made much more comfortable with respect to them all if I could get access to copies.

With reward to the 230 items remaining, I shall here deal only with those that are clearly erroneous or else apparently open to reasonable suspicion. The first class is very small; indeed, in view of Defoe's protean character, I am not sure that I should be willing practically to swear that Lee erred in ascribing any tract save No. 94, "A Letter to a Friend, giving an Account how the Treaty of Union has been received here," Edinburgh, 1706. This, as Mr. Aitken has already noted, belongs to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik (cf. his "Memoirs," 1892, p. 244). But I have strong reasons to believe that No. 61, "A True State of the Difference Between Sir George Rooke, Kt., and William Colepeper, Esq." (1704), was written by Colepeper, possibly with Defoe's assistance; that No. 55, "Legion's Humble Address to the Lords" (1704), for which a certain Pierce went into hiding, was wrongly fathered upon Defoe; that No. 109, "A Reproof to Mr. Clark, and a Brief Vindication of Mr. DeFoe" (1709), was actually, as it purports to be, the work of a third party, Lee not having seen another manifesto on the squabble issued by Defoe; that No. 180, "A Short Narrative of the Life and Death of John Rhinholdt, Count Patkul" (1717), was really, as the "Somers' Tracts" stated long ago, written by Lord Molesworth—a catalogue of the errors that have accumulated around this pamphlet and the German account on which it was based, would fill a page or two; that No. 214, "The Life and Actions of Lewis Dominique Cartouche" (1722), was not only the translation from the French it purported to be, but, as Mr. Aitken has pointed out, was not clearly enough in Defoe's style to warrant an ascription; and that finally, again as Mr. Aitken has noted and as Sir Walter Scott may be held to have believed, No. 217, "The Highland Rogue, or the Memorable Actions of the Celebrated Robert Macgregor; commonly called Rob Roy" (1723), has very little claim to be regarded as a work of Defoe's. Seven errors, or eight, if we count "A Remarkable Passage," etc.; of which two are declared to be such mainly upon considerations of style, is surely a small list for so tangled a bibliography.

The list of suspected items with regard to which I do not find myself on Lee's side, is even smaller. The devoted biographer went too far when he wrote in his Introduction:

> Two things, however, I desire to affirm—modestly, but with a strong assurance: That Daniel Defoe was the author of all the works I have ascribed to him; and that he was not the author of any of the works heretofore attributed to him, but which I have omitted.

Yet, although Lee erred both in his assertions and in his denials, and although the list of omissions is probably far greater than he had any idea would be the case, it remains true that his fifteen or twenty years' devotion to his favorite author yielded results which, to say the least, make the exclusion of his own name from the "Dictionary of National Biography" a matter for surprise.

The first of the suspicious items is No. 3, "The Englishman's Choice and True Interest, etc." (1694), which is possibly Defoe's, but is by no means sufficiently in his manner to warrant positive ascription. So with No. 31, the poem "Good Advice to the Ladies" (1702), which Wilson omitted on the score of an ostensible but not clear denial of its authorship made by Defoe in the *Little Review*. Personally I am inclined to agree with Lee in believing it to be Defoe's, chiefly because an apparently reputable publisher's name appeared on the second edition, but it is very rash to be positive about the ascription of a bad poem, published in the interregnum between Dryden and Pope. There are half-a-dozen or more other worthless performances that were hawked about as productions of the "Author of the True-born Englishman," concerning the authorship of which no one can afford to be positive. Defoe was capable of execrable doggerel; the pirates of the day were capable of any sort of breach of honesty. These facts render the ascription of Nos. 69, 70, 71 of Lee's list very doubtful. They are excerpts from No. 68, "The Consolidator," and were rejected by Wilson and Hazlitt as mere piracies, but accepted by Lee because they contained a little matter not to be found in the book from which they were taken or purloined. I have seen only No. 69, "A Journey to the World in the Moon" (1705), which undoubtedly has a little new matter, but nothing that a pirate could not have added. Defoe may have been responsible for the trifles, or some of his contemporary denunciations of the pirates may have had reference to these very pieces. It is a matter difficult to decide, and certainly of slight consequence.

No. 103, "The Union Proverb" (1708), is mentioned here, not because I greatly doubt Defoe's authorship, but because no one has yet, to my knowledge, explained how the trifle got a place in the second edition of Oswald Dykes's "English Proverbs" (1709). Dykes was a real person, and the tract ascribed to Defoe appears in the book without an intimation that it was not the work of the ostensible author of the volume. In style and substance it seems to be Defoe's, if we suppose that he consciously imitated the form of proverb adopted by Dykes in the first edition of his book; but it is conceivable that Dykes might consciously or unconsciously have written in the style of Defoe. It would seem that more light is needed on the matter.

The next item, No. 120, "Atalantis Major," etc. (Edinburgh, 1711), is the first tract that brings before us here the question of Defoe's integrity. It was first assigned to Defoe by Lee, apparently with Crossley's approval, upon strong internal evidence. I have my doubts whether the evidence would have seemed so strong to them if they had known that on December 26, 1710, Defoe wrote to Harley from Edinburgh, that he had got hold of a manuscript libel entitled "Atalantis Major," which he hoped to be able to suppress. He suspected a certain Englishman of being the author, but he dared not be positive. We may be positive that the tract published was the tract he saw, and that, if he really was the author, truth not only was not in him, but for some time at least had not even been near him. If we continue to assign "Atalantis Major" to him, we must be

* In these twenty-three I include "A Remarkable Passage of an Apparition" found in the compilation, "Mr. Campbell's Packet," etc. (No. 203). From the communications of Alfred F. Robbins to *Notes and Queries* (8th ser. viii, 221, 349) it would seem that Dr. Ruddle rather than Defoe wrote "A Remarkable Passage"; and certainly all stylistic tests point away from Defoe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prepared to believe that he was capable of deceiving the man to whom he had vowed eternal gratitude, and for whom he had deliberately changed the tone of his acknowledged political writings. As I propose to attribute to him several tracts which show him up in an even worse light in his relations with Harley, the ascription of this pamphlet does not specially embarrass me; but I think that in the light of Defoe's correspondence their attribution would have worried the older bibliographers. I have carefully studied the style of the performance and have nothing to say but "Aut Daniclus, aut Diabolus, aut ambo."

No. 127, "Armageddon," etc. (1711), is a tract which has involved me in much perplexity. On the score of the nature of the arguments it uses with regard to the carrying on of the war then in progress, a fair case might be made out against Defoe's authorship, and I have seen a copy in the British Museum endorsed in an old hand—"supposed to be writ by Mr. Asgill." The stylistic evidence, however, is so strong for Defoe that I cannot but conclude that he wrote the pamphlet. It is worth noting that "Armageddon" and "The Balance of Europe" (No. 128 of Lee) can scarcely be given to Defoe if we accept literally the statements made by him in the introduction to his acknowledged "Essay at a Plain Exposition of that Difficult Phrase a Good Peace" (No. 129 of Lee's list). I am not in the habit of accepting such statements; Lee and Crossley appear to have accepted them when they specially wanted to take sides against Defoe's contemporaries, like Boyer and Toland. Wilson seems to have been more consistent in rejecting both "Armageddon" and "The Balance of Europe," though I feel sure from both external and internal evidence that he was wrong in both cases.

No. 152, "The Scots Nation and Union Vindicated, etc." (1714), has also been attributed to Gorge Ridpath (cf. Halkett and Laing); but Mr. Aitken does not mention it in his article on Ridpath in the "Dictionary of National Biography," and there is no lack of grounds on which Lee's ascription to Defoe may be defended. It would be a pity were he deprived of the tract, for it affords evidence that its author had in his possession a list of Scotch officers who served under Gustavus Adolphus, and this fact has its bearings on a point I shall not discuss in these notes, Defoe's claim to that famous book, the "Memoirs of a Cavalier." I may add that I have as little intention of discussing the story that Harley wrote "Robinson Crusoe," or of endeavoring to clear up a slight doubt that hangs over the authorship of "The History of the Life and Adventures of Mr. Duncan Campbell."

Nos. 160, 161, and 162, to wit, the three parts of the notorious "Secret History of the White Staff," must next occupy us a moment, for there really seems to be no ground for ascribing No. 159, "A Secret History of One Year;" to Sir Robert Walpole. The "White Staff" pamphlets have been attributed to Defoe ever since they appeared (1714-15), and even Lee is compelled by the evidence afforded by their style and substance to wriggle out of the plainly intended, though not frankly and clearly expressed, disclaimer of Defoe ("Appeal to Honour and Justice"), and to assign them to his hero with a tribute to his "courage and faithfulness" that under the circumstances is truly pathetic. Adequately to discuss this vexed question of authorship is impossible here, but I may say that some points which I have gleaned from Defoe's correspondence with Harley and a specially important stylistic clue, together with some charges made against Defoe in a contemporary pamphlet which has not to my knowledge been utilized by previous students, have removed every lingering doubt from my mind and have furthermore made me confident that, piqued by Harley's rejection of books designed to aid him, Defoe, as the contemporary pamphlet just mentioned charges, added what are practically a fourth and a fifth part of the "White Staff" series—to wit, "Memoirs of the Conduct of Her Late Majesty and Her Last Ministry, etc." (1715), and "The Secret History of the Secret History of the White Staff, Purse and Mitre" (1715). The former of these was attributed to Defoe by Crossley, apparently without a knowledge of the pamphlet which led me to it independently, and a copy in the Yale Library is endorsed in a recent hand "plainly by Defoe." The latter of the two pamphlets was read by Lee and utilized in his book, but obviously without exciting in him the suspicion that he was reading an attempt made by Defoe himself to treat as mere unreliable hack-work pamphlets by booksellers' tools what he had undoubtedly at first put forth as more or less authorized pleas in Harley's behalf. The stylistic evidence in favor of these two tracts is almost if not wholly as strong as that which made Lee accept the three parts of the "White Staff" series, and, after all, the substance of the additions to the series is not of a nature to make even a stanch admirer of Defoe refuse to accept them.

No. 169, a long "History of the Wars of his present Majesty Charles XII., King of Sweden," which appeared in 1715, and was augmented in 1720, did not pass unchallenged when Lee issued his catalogue, but Crossley, the greatest authority on Defoe's bibliography, supported Lee heartily. A positive verdict in the matter should hardly be reached, I think, until a careful study is made of the materials at that time available for a biographer of Charles XII., and much the same thing may be said with regard to No. 216, "An Impartial History of the Life and Actions of Peter Alexowitz, the present Czar of Moscovy, etc." (1723). My own study of the books themselves and of Defoe's frequent references in other places to the two monarchs leads me to incline strongly to support Lee and Crossley in their attributions.

Nos. 175 and 176, "Some Considerations on a Law for Triennial Parliaments" and "The Alteration in the Triennial Act Considered" (1716), lure us into one of the worst quagmires to be found in Defoe's bibliography. In *Notes and Queries*, 1st ser., v., pp. 577-9, Crossley called attention to the fact that in *Mercurius Politicus* for July, 1716, a letter from Defoe was reprinted in which he denied writing a tract against the proposed abrogation of triennial parliaments, entitled "The Triennial Act Impartially Stated," which Boyer had laid at his door in the *Political State*, a year before; and in which on the other hand Defoe claimed as his a tract on the opposite side of the controversy, entitled "Arguments About the Alteration of Triennial Elections of Parliaments," which Boyer had fathered on Addison. Crossley accepted Defoe's disclaimer of the former tract, but could not admit his claim to the authorship of the latter. His chief reasons for this position were that the "Arguments" was not in Defoe's style, and that it denounced the Bill of Commerce with France which Defoe had warmly supported in undoubtedly genuine articles and pamphlets. He admitted that if Defoe were indeed the author of the "Arguments," the charges made by contemporaries that he was willing to write on both sides of a question would be substantiated. But, believing firmly in Defoe's political integrity, Crossley was driven to frame some hypothesis that would explain the former's letter in *Mercurius Politicus* (which by the way had *named* neither tract under discussion); and this he found in the assumption that, a year having elapsed between Boyer's charge and Defoe's reply, the latter's memory had failed him and he had confounded the pamphlet praised by Boyer, to wit, the "Arguments," with one only mentioned by Boyer, to wit, that which Lee makes No. 175 of his list. No. 176 of Lee's list, which was also enumerated by Boyer and with regard to which Defoe was equally silent in his letter, is not mentioned in Crossley's discussion, but he seems to have acquiesced in Lee's ascription of it to Defoe.

For my own part I have considerable respect for Defoe's power to remember details, but, as I have already said, very little for his willingness to tell the truth about his own writings, or for his consistency in political matters. I have found in the past few months fully half a dozen tracts that oppose Defoe's official attitude toward Harley and his measures, yet are as clearly products of the great pamphleteer's pen as most of those that are assigned to him by Lee and Crossley. Besides, a careful scrutiny of other tracts assigned by Crossley to Defoe does not reassure us as to the latter's consistency, and it is always possible to argue that in tracts like the "Arguments" written in the form of a letter to a representative of a group of voters, Defoe took a point of view acceptable to the class for whom he was writing, rather than one consistent with his utterances as a paid writer in the service of Harley. As a matter of fact, I have been reluctantly forced to conclude that Defoe defended the policy of Harley and the Tories while his heart was really with his old employer Godolphin and the Whigs; and that on the accession of George I., he gave himself the pleasure of denouncing, under various disguises, the policies and the politicians he had been bribed or persuaded to support.

Be this as it may, I have no doubt whatsoever that he did write, "Some Considerations" (No. 175); I think it very likely that he wrote the "Arguments" as he says he did, for the style of that seems to me to be much more in Defoe's vein than Crossley anxious to defend his hero's consistency, was willing to admit; and—"alas! for the rarity of Christian charity"—I am equally disposed to hold that he also wrote the tract in opposition to these two,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Triennial Act Impartially Stated," which, in the chastened language of Boyer, "was judged, from its loose style and way of arguing, to be written by that prostituted tool of the last ministry, D—D—F." In other words, I agree with Crossley in assigning one tract, with Defoe in assigning another, with Boyer in assigning a third to the will o' the wisp whose devious courses I am trying to follow. I have formed my opinions upon internal evidence only, for I place practically no reliance on Defoe's own statement, since he hated Boyer so intensely, that he would, I think, have been quite capable of claiming the pamphlet Boyer praised and disclaiming the one Boyer denounced, merely to have the laugh on his adversary. It should be remembered, too, in this connection that the letter in which Defoe deals with these pamphlets was not written primarily about them, but was designed to repel another charge Boyer had brought, viz., that Defoe had made up out of whole cloth the recently published "Minutes of the Negotiations of Mons. Mesnager," which purported to be a translation from the French. We shall see in a moment that there is scarcely a doubt but that Defoe was impudently false in his denial of this main charge of Boyer's, and I believe that, having decided to brazen the matter out, he concluded that he might as well hark back a year and deny Boyer's former charge, on the principle that one may gain credence in proportion to the magnitude of one's effrontery.

As for No. 176, "The Alteration in the Triennial Act Considered," and for two other pamphlets in favor of longer parliaments, to wit, "A Letter to a Friend in Suffolk Occasioned by a Report of Repealing the Triennial Act" and a "Second Letter" to the same friend, both of which were attributed to Defoe by the late Col. Grant, I find myself in doubt whether the internal evidence is strong enough to warrant a positive ascription. Certainly Crossley and Lee could not consistently have accepted the two letters, for the writer of them denounced Harley and his ministry; but the style of all three pamphlets leads one strongly to suspect Defoe's authorship. Six pamphlets on one subject within a few days—and may be not also have written "The Innkeepers Opinion of the Triennial Act"?—seem too many to saddle even on Defoe; but we must remember that they were well distributed among rival publishers and that the subject was one upon which Defoe's new political employers would have been glad to have his assistance. The arguments employed do not vary greatly in any of the tracts I have read on the subject, and at Defoe's rate of composition he could have written the whole batch in four or five days. But perhaps it is a good plan "to split even"; to assign him three pamphlets very positively, and three provisionally.

No. 181 is the already mentioned "Minutes of the Negotiations of Mons. Mesnager, at the Court of England, Towards the Close of the last Reign," the authorship of which Defoe vigorously denied. I can add little to Lee's exhaustive discussion of the questions involved (cf. his letters in *Notes and Queries*, 4th ser., v., 177, 202), save to say that internal evidence makes it certain that the author of the "Minutes" was an Englishman and most probably Defoe, and that modern students of the diplomacy of the period (cf. A. Legrelle's "La Diplomatie française et la succession d'Espagne") make no use of the book. Defoe's references to it in his "Memoirs . . . of the Duke of Shrewsbury" (Lee's list, No. 185) render me still more confident that he was responsible for the fabrication.

These are all the items in Lee's list that seem to me to lie open to any suspicion worth recording here, except one of the picaresque tracts, No. 248, "Street Robberies considered" (1728), which in the opinion of Dr. Frank W. Chandler, our chief authority on this class of writings, "unlike Defoe's authentic picaresque work, is marked by ironical humor in the right Spanish vein," and No. 252, the prose pages prefixed to Robert Dodsley's poem "Servitude" (1729). With regard to the former of these I am inclined to think that, on the whole, the style and certain features the tract has in common with other contemporary tracts certainly by Defoe warrant us in continuing to ascribe it to him, at least for the present. As for the latter I confess I am not convinced that Lee did not give a free rein to his imagination when he described how the old and ill Defoe wrote several pages satirizing one of his own tracts in order to fill out and help to sell a book by a struggling young author. The arguments Lee gives in support of his ascription appear to me not very sound, and the question seems mainly to turn on the correct dating of an undated edition of the tract. If Hazlitt and the British Museum authorities are correct in their surmise "circa 1725," Lee, who is followed in the article on Dodsley in the "Dictionary of National Biography," is probably wrong in his ascription; but I am not yet in a position to clear the matter up. It is time, however, to pass from Lee's possible errors of commission to what seem to be his errors of omission, which shall form the subject of my next communication.

W. P. Trent.

Correspondence.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The letter of Professor Harrington on the University of Maine contained so many specious pleas that I ask leave to challenge and answer some of them. When he says that the dangers to small colleges in private hands from State institutions giving free instruction, have proved imaginary, he is wide of the mark. This socialism in education has injured greatly the small colleges both in Maine and other States, while it has done, and is doing, great injustice to the wage-earning classes everywhere. Their children in almost all instances have to go to work when they are seventeen, but the beneficiaries of the State University are a small portion of the children of the middle class of citizens, whose income per year is between $1,200 and $3,000. That is, Peter is robbed to pay Paul. President Hyde and his associates did just what was right, not only for their own institutions, but for the working men of Maine, when they opposed the large appropriation for an institution, which gets most of its money out of the public treasury. Maine is comparatively a poor State. Its industries are lumbering, farming, ice gathering, textile manufacturing in the west, fisheries, and commerce. The population of its largest city is only 50,000, while the whole State population numbers 700,000. According to the statistics of 1903-1904, there were in the university altogether 415, distributed thus among the following courses: 109 electrical engineering, 135 civil engineering, fifty-one mechanical engineering, ten agriculture, fifty-one general science, thirty-five non-classical course, twenty-four classical course. Fifteen were studying Latin and eight Greek. The institution in any one year benefits one-fifteenth of one per cent. of the population. The college part of the institution barely numbers one hundred. Yet it asked this year for $150,000 a year from the public treasury, and finally got $65,000 for two years and $90,000 for buildings.

Professor Harrington affects to deride this argument by showing that if the amount spent on the classical department were appropriated to the teachers of Maine it would not buy them each a new hat. He does not deny the principle, but by taking a very small portion of the appropriation figures out a small quotient. Let us try a fairer method. New York has just spent $5,000,000 on the new buildings of the City College, taken from the taxpayers, and thus increased the cost of education per capita through that institution 50 to 75 per cent., because of interest on investment and increase in the annual budget. Only the wisdom of the late Gov. Higgins prevented the repetition of this unjust form of taxation in Brooklyn. Now, suppose the authorities had said: "This use of so much money on the favored few, who should get their college education by paying for it out of their own pockets, is an outrage on the working classes, for whom our educational system is primarily intended. We will spend this enormous sum entirely on the grammar schools, building new buildings that are so much needed, increasing the number of teachers to pupils, and paying more attention to backward pupils."

Mr. Harrington's argument about the benefit to Maine taxpayers of money brought in by Massachusetts students reminds me of some arguments I have heard about the beneficent effects of a high protective tariff. He seems to think that money paid out circulates through all pockets, like blood through the human body. He says "half of the $20,000 brought by Massachusetts students goes to the university and half to the taxpayers." That may go to the taxpayers of Orono, who do not support the university, but are largely supported by it. But very little of it goes to the taxpayers of the State.

It not only involves injustice to Maine, but has set a demoralizing example to other New England States. An organization called the New England Education League apparently is trying to promote this form of Socialism in Massachusetts, and in Connecticut there are indications of a similar movement in a small way in connection with the Storrs Agricultural School. The University of Michigan alone deserves among Western institutions the approval of those who believe in justice to the working classes. It has always set its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

face like a flint against free tuition, and, though one of the largest, takes less than a half million, this year, from the State Treasury. Compare that amount with Minnesota, asking for an aggregate appropriation of $1,500,000, Wisconsin $1,200,000, and Illinois $5,300,000, with a desire to establish a graduate department, a most costly and extravagant function, in rivalry with the University of Chicago.

GEORGE L. FOX.

New Haven, May 31.

COLONIAL FRANCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I read in the *Nation* of May 9 that Indo-China "represents, as yet, the only instance of appreciable success in colonial administration that France can show," and that "its loss would undoubtedly mean the end of the republic as a colonial, and, possibly, as a world-power." Will you allow a Frenchman to protest against such misleading statements? Indo-China is at present the richest colony that France has, but great foreign experts, such as Sir Harry Johnston, had already paid a high tribute to the success of French rule in Tunis when Indo-China was still struggling and unpopular. Our largest colony, the West African Federation, under Gov. Roume, has shown the most wonderful vitality. The loss of Indo-China would not mean the end of the republic as a colonial power. Indeed, ardent colonialists, like the well-known geographer, Onésime Reclus, advocate our giving up of Indo-China altogether, the future of France as a colonial power being in Africa. Without Indo-China, France would still be by far the second largest colonial power in the world, with an empire as large as the whole of the United States and possessions. The magnitude of that empire, and its commercial importance—for its total trade at present is about $200,000,000—is a fact that the French themselves have only recently realized. The English taught us that we had large, prosperous, well-governed colonies. The Germans knew it before we did. And the Americans will certainly learn it in their turn.

ALBERT L. GUÉRARD.

Williamstown, May 16.

THE EXCHANGE OF PROFESSORS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: My attention has been called to an article in the *Nation* of May 30, on the "Exchange of Professors," in which only one of the statements about Professor Richards is correct. He *is* "one of our ablest chemists," but he did not learn "nearly all that he knows from Germany." On the contrary, his training was entirely American in the determination of atomic weights—the work on which his reputation principally rests, and the subject of his lectures in Berlin.

He is lecturing in German; and, even if he were not, his lectures could not degenerate into "a pastime for some members of the American or British colony," as they can be understood only by advanced students in chemistry.

Moreover, strangely enough, Germany has never taken the highest rank in the determination of atomic weights, although pre-eminent in all other branches of chemistry. The great masters in this work have been furnished by Sweden, France, Belgium, and now at last by the United States, so that Professor Richards is giving instruction in Berlin which could not be given so well by any native professor.

In addition to his lectures, he has eight doctors of philosophy studying research with him in the laboratory, thus training them in the most accurate and delicate work which has yet been done in chemistry. This alone more than justifies his visit to Berlin.

CHARLES LORING JACKSON.

Chemical Laboratory of Harvard College, June 1.

MR. TABB'S "QUIPS AND QUIDDITS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Of "Quips and Quiddits," my forthcoming book from Small, Maynard & Co., I should like to say publicly that the whole responsibility—for preface, selections, illustrations, and proofs—rests with the publishers.

JOHN B. TABB.

Ellicott City, Md., May 29.

Notes.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. are preparing the "Ponkapog" edition of Aldrich's Complete Works, in nine volumes, in the same style and size as the "Riverby" Burroughs and "Walden" Thoreau.

Longmans, Green & Co. will soon publish an illustrated edition of Cardinal Newman's "Dream of Gerontius." They have also about ready the seventh volume of "The Political History of England—From the Accession of James I. to the Restoration," by Prof. F. C. Montague.

The Cambridge University Press (Putnams) has about ready the second volume of A. R. Waller's edition of Matthew Prior. In this volume are printed for the first time Prior's "Dialogues of the Dead," and numerous unpublished verses.

Elizabeth Luther Cary has prepared for Putnams a volume on Daumier the caricaturist.

We learn from the Macmillan Co., the American publishers of the series, that the twentieth, and concluding, volume of "Purchas His Pilgrimes," was printed, and in the binder's hands, before the death of Robert MacLehose.

The "Essays, Literary and Historical," of John Fiske have been reissued by Macmillans in a single volume. The same house has also issued in a single volume Mrs. J. R. Green's "Town Life in the Fifteenth Century." Neither of these works needs any recommendation to-day.

John Lane Company has brought out a new edition of H. T. Wharton's "Sappho," with illustrations in photogravure. Besides Mr. Wharton's memoir of the poetess and his literal translations of her verse, the book gives a number of metrical translations from various writers.

E. P. Dutton & Co. have about ready a new "Life of Captain James Cook," by Arthur Kitson. It is said that the earlier lives—by Kippis, Hawkesworth, and Douglas—are erroneous, and have taken unpardonable liberties with Cook's own manuscripts. Will this bring a revival of interest in Capt. Cook, who was for so long the traveller, *par excellence*?

Mrs. A. L. Wister has placed in the hands of the J. B. Lippincott Company what will probably be her last work of translation. It is from her favorite author, Adolph Streckfuss, and is called "The Lonely House." She has not done any work of the kind for about fifteen years.

There are to be six new volumes in D. C. Heath & Co.'s Belles-Lettres Series, viz.: "The Fair Penitent and Jane Shore," edited by Prof. Sophie Chantal Hart; Chapman's "All Fools and the Gentleman Usher," by Prof. T. M. Parrott; "The Spanish Gypsy and All's Lost by Lust," by Prof. E. P. Morris; "Exodus and Daniel in West Saxon," by Prof. F. A. Blackburn; "The Owl and the Nightingale," by Prof. J. E. Wells, and "Select Poems of Alfred Tennyson," by Prof. Archibald MacMechan.

Henry Holt & Co. announce a fourth edition of Owen Seaman's burlesque "Borrowed Plumes." Mr. Seaman is the editor of *Punch*.

The publication of Paget Toynbee's work on Dante's influence in English literature has been delayed by the discovery of a mass of new material.

Biblical students will be interested in the announcement that the Pope has issued a decree entrusting the revision of the Vulgate to the monks of the Benedictine order. This is the most important result as yet of the Biblical Commission which was appointed towards the end of the Pontificate of Leo XIII. Since the Clementine edition of 1592 there has been no official revision of the text, which as a matter of fact has never been scientifically ascertained. No pains or time will be spared to restore the exact text of St. Jerome.

We are soon to have a hitherto unknown work by Verlaine, entitled "Le Voyage en France par un Français." It is a voyage in the sense of literary and political criticism, and dates from 1880, when Verlaine was an ardent convert to religion. Another French book about to appear is "Avant Machiavel," the first part of "Le Machiavélisme," by Charles Benoist.

Oscar Wegelin is preparing a second series of "Early American Poetry," being titles of books and pamphlets written by authors born or residing in the United States and Canada, and printed between 1800 and 1820. It will be published in the fall in an edition of one hundred and fifty copies.

The first number of the quarterly *Bulletin of the Bibliographical Society of America* has just appeared. Bibliographical periodicals in America have been generally short-lived. This *Bulletin* has a modest beginning, the first number containing fourteen pages only of reading matter. The president of the society, W. C. Lane, librarian of Harvard University, warns the members that the success of the quarterly will depend upon their coöperation. The purpose is to make it a record of current bibliographical work in America. The greater part of the titles recorded in the *Bulletin* will be of special bibliographies of various kinds, but works on the science

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and art of bibliography, works on manuscripts and public archives, accounts of libraries and collections, both public and private, library catalogues and contributions to the history of printing and bookselling, will find a place. The commercial side of printing and bookselling as well as library administration will be excluded. The editors are W. Dawson Johnston, T. Franklin Currier, and Victor H. Paltsits.

The American Type Founders Company, which is a consolidation of all but one of the letter-founders established in America prior to 1869, is bringing together at their central establishment in Jersey City a library and museum relating to letter founding and printing in general in America. The idea was first suggested by Henry L. Bullen in an article "Discursions of a Retired Printer," published in the *Inland Printer* in July, 1906. He there called attention to the desirability of bringing together in one place a library of books on printing and typefounding, and the actual matrices, types, and printing apparatus used by American printers, corresponding to some extent to the Plantin Museum at Antwerp and that of Enschedé & Sons at Haarlem. The suggestion interested the officers of the company, and money was appropriated for the acquisition of such material under the direction of Mr. Bullen. As the result of only about six months' effort, the collection is already important, including among the rest a very nearly complete series of American type-specimen books. The first New York type-founder, Adam Gerard Mappa, who came here in 1791, used a type specimen book printed at Delft, Holland, in 1787. The only copy known is in this collection. Christopher Saur established the first type-foundry in America at Germantown in 1772. Jacob Bay, 1774, and John Baine, 1778, followed at Philadelphia. These three, with Mappa's establishment at New York, were merged into one by Binney & Ronaldson in 1796; it has ever since been in operation at Philadelphia.

A new section of the Oxford English Dictionary carries the slow alphabetic procession from Piper to Polygenistic, edited by Dr. James A. H. Murray. As in all the sections the great distinguishing feature here is the number of illustrative quotations, showing the historical changes in the meaning of a word; which is the one supreme function of a dictionary. The number of such quotations in the present section is 20,848, against 2,207 in the corresponding section of the Century, and 438 in the Standard.

We have newly received the spring number of the *Revue internationale des études basques*, which appeared for the first time last January under the editorship of Don Julio de Urquijo. Of its contents written partly in French, partly in Spanish, partly in Basque, a large proportion relate to things philological. Of this nature are F. Baraibhar's article on the Alavesan words not figuring in the Dictionary of the Real Academia; De Charencey's "Etymologie Basque," H. Schuchardt's explanation of the forms "Dautza" and "dauntza," and the notes by Luis de Eleizalde on Vinson's "Études Basques," and the "Otoitz Gayak" of P. Mendiburu. History and biography are represented by G. Lacombe's monograph on Prince Lucien Bonaparte, by V. Dubarat's article on the "Assézat" and the "Chéverry at Toulouse," and De Yaurgain's account of the friend of Henry of Navarre, Corisande d'Andoins, Dame de Gramont. Among others items the forthcoming numbers will include a translation into French of H. Schuchardt's paper, entitled "Baskisch und Romanisch," articles on old Basque names, and the Iberian tongue, or tongues, by D. Arturo Campion and Julien Vinson, a biographical study of Yuan de Iciar Vizcaíno, and reproductions in photogravure of an old Biscayan catechism and of the "Borracho Burlado," a comic opera in Basque and Castilian by a noble of Guipuzcoa.

The last volume of the Proceedings of the Scottish Antiquaries (Edinburgh, Neil & Co.) contains twenty-four papers in all. As usual they fall under two heads: eighteen relate to finds, excavations, buildings, etc., mainly of the pre-historic and pre-mediæval periods; six to literary, historical, and similar subjects. Of the former class of contributions the most elaborate is the account of the Roman Forts on Bar Hill (Dumbartonshire), amounting to over a hundred pages, by George Macdonald and Alexander Park, and the report on the stone circles of Banffshire, by Fred R. Coles. Important, too, are Lieut.-Col. McHardy's "Vitrified Forts," John M. Loney's notice of the Long Graves, near the source of the North Esk; R. Munro's notes on a find of stone knives, presented by the Right Hon. R. C. Haldane, and the account of the cemetery of Nunraw, by the Hon. Y. Abercromby, and A. Mactier Pirrie. The less ancient remains date for the most part from Post-Reformation tomes; such are the monuments in the churchyards of Currie, Kirknewton, and the Calders, described by Alan Reid, and the Castle on the Isle of Loch Dochart, Perthshire, described by Mrs. Place. Of the second class of papers the most interesting are Alexander O. Curle's "Inventories of the House of Rossie, Montrose" (from 1693-1740), and Caird Inglis's account of John Paul Jones.

Industrial education in Austria is the subject of a suggestive report to the Department of Commerce by Special Agent A. B. Butman. The present method has been developed within the last ten years, its main underlying purpose being the endeavor to form a close connection and interdependence between school and practice. The best results are said to have been attained by those schools requiring as one of the terms of admission some years' previous practice in workshops, such pupils forming the most promising material and proving the more eager students. A typical institution is the Technological Trade Museum of Vienna, in which at a very small fee instruction is given in the chemical and metal trades together with a general education, *i.e.*, in language, mathematics, physics, etc. Absolutely free tuition, however, is given in woodworking, plumbing, carpentering and joining, shoemaking, dressmaking, and tailoring, etc., small model shops, with their attendant foremen and managers, being provided for practical instruction. The shoemaker's course may be completed in six weeks, and includes anatomy of the feet, measure taking, cutting, computing, etc. The joiner's course occupies eight weeks, during which time a knowledge of the scientific treatment of woods is taught. Legal instruction pertaining to the respective courses is given in every case. To aid needy students the Government provides stipends and scholarships. Since the opening of this institution, 3,026 artisans have received instruction in their trades. The Government also maintains teachers who travel regularly in the provinces, giving similar instruction to natives in remote country towns.

"Church Philanthropy in New York" is the title of a valuable book of facts concerning the large and varied social effort of the Episcopal Church in this city (Thomas Whitaker). The author, the Rev. Floyd Appleton, Ph.D., has sketched briefly the history of the many Episcopal philanthropic institutions, and on the basis of extensive compilation of statistics he offers suggestions as to promising lines of future activity. The pamphlet is a convenient manual of information concerning a large class of remedial institutions, which have been supported with self-sacrifice and administered with efficiency.

The "Fünfjahr-Katalog," issued every half-decade by the house of Hinrichs in Leipzig, contains in the issue covering the period of 1901 to 1905, on 2,371 pages, a complete list of the books, journals, pamphlets, maps, etc., which have been issued by the German book publishers during this period. In addition to the usual exhaustive index of subjects and authors, the present issue contains a number of new features, such as bibliographical notices, changes in the titles of periodicals, and the like. This collective catalogue is a standard work for bibliophiles and indispensable for libraries.

The oldest son and heir of Lord Rothschild, Walter Rothschild, has prepared a work on the different kinds of birds which have become extinct during the past seven hundred years. The book is to be published in the near future in an absolutely permanent shape. It is printed on a kind of paper which years of experiments have proved to be indestructible, a quality which the author insisted upon because the work is to remain a lasting record of these extinct birds. The cost of publication is computed at about one hundred thousand dollars, and only three hundred copies will be issued, selling at $125 each.

The second volume of David Jayne Hill's "History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe" (Longmans, Green & Co.) betrays no marked departure from his method in the first. As we said of that, so must we say of this, that he seems to have sought an excuse for re-writing history. It recalls the old Darwin story about giving a tired boy a cane astride of which to gallop home refreshed. If you are weary of dull annals, says Mr. Hill, let us call them "diplomacy," and then see how enlivening they at once become. He appears to be innocently aware of his logical difficulty. "Definitions," he writes, in his preface, "have their proper place at the end, rather than at the beginning of historical studies. If we define diplomacy as it now exists, we shall, of course, *fail to find it in the earlier periods.*" Hence the plan of calling every-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing diplomacy that comes to the net. The present volume traces "The Establishment of Territorial Sovereignty" from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. The author has shown great industry in going to the sources; but his skeletonized account of so large and long a movement is necessarily dry reading. By any other name than diplomacy, it would have smelled as much of the lamp.

S. G. Tallentyre's "Friends of Voltaire" (Putnams) consists of a disconnected series of sketches, not bound together even by any consistent plan of reference to Voltaire. They are ecstatic expositions of some supposedly eminent trait in each case, rather than true biographies. The subjects are D'Alembert the Thinker, Diderot the Talker, Vauvenargues the Aphorist, Helvetius the Contradiction, Turgot the Statesman, Condorcet the Aristocrat, etc. By this method the modesty of nature is violated and nothing is left except high lights. We have such edifying results, for example, as this: "The eighteenth century, even if it saw any difference between vice and virtue, which is doubtful . . . "; and this "To her [Mlle. de Lespinasse], as to a sister of consolation, came Condorcet, marquis, mathematician, philosopher." In the effort to be vivid the author becomes vapid. For some reason not readily discernible, he likes to turn his sentences hind end foremost, in what is known as the inverted order. He uses all the little tricks by which "popular" books of this kind are made. In less than three pages Voltaire is patted on the back as "brother Voltaire," "old Voltaire," "friend Voltaire." Apart from these petty vices and the constant effort to awaken the momentary interest of uninformed readers, the book has a certain journalistic merit. It can be read rapidly, and many of its judgments strike one as sound, while still more of them are no doubt sincere.

In Dr. Gaston Bodart's "Militär-historisches Kriegs-Lexikon" (Wien and Leipzig: C. W. Stern), we have really a novelty, whether from a military or an historical point of view. The time of the book is 1618-1905, and we have before us the first of the six parts (1618-1702). The arrangement is purely chronological, each battle, land or sea, siege, engagement, affair, being presented, where possible, under the form of a commercial account as it were. Place, date, commanding generals, numbers and kinds of troops engaged, losses, and trophies, all these are clearly set forth by a judicious selection of type and spacing. Were this all, the book would still command attention as a work of reference, but the author has greatly increased its value by adding tables and excursus growing out of the subject: for example, to mention only two, tables of losses by fire, estimation of the relative shares of European states in single wars. An alphabetical index is to close the work, the indication of sources and authorities being reserved for the last number, though serially it is a part of the first.

After a painful illness of several years, Ludwig Traube, professor at the University of Munich, died on May 19, at the age of forty-six. Already one of the foremost authorities on mediæval Latin literature and palæography, he had only begun to realize far-reaching plans in both these domains. His largest work was the edition of Vol. III. of the Carolingian poets in the Monumenta Germaniæ Historica. He wrote also numerous articles and monographs, each original if not epoch-making in character. His last undertaking was the publication of a new series—Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters—which was to embody in studies by himself, his friends, and his pupils, principles and methods that he had made all his own. Vol. I. had appeared, and he was at work on an important article for the second volume at the time of his death. Of an infallible memory and amazing powers of acquisition, Traube united with these traits of the encyclopædist the delicacy and penetration of a literary critic. His lectures, while teeming with well-ordered information, avoided professorial system, and were delivered with eloquence. Not a few among the younger American scholars can bear witness also to his generous hospitality, his ready sympathy, and kindly help.

Judge William Kneeland Townsend of the Second District, United States Circuit Court, died in New Haven on Saturday morning. He was born in New Haven in 1849, and graduated at Yale in 1871, receiving the degree of LL.B. in 1874, and that of D.C.L. in 1880. His legal career was begun in New Haven, where he became corporation counsel for the city. In 1892 he was appointed judge of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, and in 1902 he was promoted to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of the Second Circuit. In addition to his active service on the bench, which he did not relinquish, in spite of ill-health, Judge Townsend was professor of the law of contracts at Yale University, and was regarded as one of Yale's most brilliant sons. He was a contributor to the magazines, and the author of several legal works, among them, "New Connecticut Civil Officers," "History of the American Law of Patents," and "Trademarks, Copyrights, and Admiralty."

WOMEN OF ANTIQUITY.

Woman: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome, and Among the Early Christians. By James Donaldson. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. $1.60 net.

The story of the evolution of woman in civilized society is so thickly set with contradictions and inconsistencies that a writer who is determined to tell it without partiality is practically cut off from the luxury of generalizations. There are few so determined as that, especially where impartiality is so likely to make dull reading. Accordingly, in almost every volume whose title begins with the word "Woman," we must reckon with a *parti pris*. One writer proceeds to prove from the pages of history that only under absolute monarchies have women enjoyed or can expect to enjoy even a semblance of their rights, so that "Down with democracy" should be the war-cry of American suffragists. Another demonstrates from the same evidence that socialism alone can free women from slavery. Benecke easily explains away every passage in Greek literature that conflicts with his thesis that romantic love was unknown to literature until a poet whose works have perished, an older contemporary of Plato, Antimachus of Colophon, sat down to write an elegy in honor of his dead wife. If Benecke be right, many a page of excellent sentiment has been wasted on the parting of Hector and Andromache, and the relations of Odysseus and Penelope. Even a scholar who has no particular thesis to support—Tucker in his recently published "Life in Ancient Athens"—falls into generalizations rather than leave the question open. "To an Athenian," he says, "marriage was apt to be irksome," and he offers as proof the joke in Antiphanes: "What! Is he actually married? Why I left him alive and taking exercise." This is a jest out of which the humor will never die, and for that reason it tells us nothing about the wives of the fourth century B. C. The vicissitudes of women in Greece and Rome must be gathered from the writings of men, from Homer down, and, when stated in general terms, should always be accompanied by a list of exceptions to illustrate the variety of human character and the difficulty of measuring the influence of women by a recital of their legal rights or disqualifications. Of such evidence Dr. Donaldson is none too lavish.

Every one will assent to his account of the Homeric woman of rank and of the honors and dignities which she shared with her husband, as she still shares them in aristocratic societies to-day. When he fell, his lot was death, and hers slavery; the etiquette that made her follow her conqueror must have been due to her own preference for survival at any cost, and we need not shed more tears for Andromache than for Hector. So much for the woman of rank as we see her on the surface, that is, as men envisaged her when they gave us the charming picture of Nausicaa's domestic tastes, and ignored any posible justification for Clytemnestra's vengeance on the cruel and unfaithful Agamemnon. Dr. Donaldson, like so many others, omits all that one may read between the lines: the humiliation of women of rank by the ever-present and always more beautiful concubine, and all the other drawbacks to home life that may be assumed in that half-civilized military society. What was the treatment of women of the lower class we can only conjecture.

Under the Athenian republic any free male citizen was more important than any woman. Dr. Donaldson's explanation is that the men of Ionian descent who made Athens the glory that was Greece, kept up their race traditions and regarded their wives with an almost Oriental eye, whereas the Lesbians and Dorians allowed them far greater freedom. An Athenian woman must not be seen or heard except at religious festivals, of which frequent opportunities they obviously made good use. Nevertheless, the wife's dowry stayed with her, even when she was repudiated by her husband; and we may say in passing that the relation of a woman to her dowry throws only a misguiding light on her social position and influence in Greece and Rome. Considered strictly according to her legal status, the married woman at Athens was a being

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so incapable that, should she give her husband a piece of advice, and should he take it, his action on it was set aside by the law. Her husband could repudiate a woman if she drank a single glass of wine. Are we therefore to generalize about the temperance and humility of the average Athenian wife? We might as well suppose that the picture in Xenophon of the young wife who, "once tamed," was devoted to her duties, is a realistic portrait. Against it we may set the only Athenian wife of classical times of whom we know anything definite, Xanthippe, the scold, or the matrons of the "Ecclesiazousæ" of Aristophanes, who storm the Assembly like modern suffragists only with a good deal more strategy and success. Never can you measure the actual influence of woman by her legal status. Let us hope that the historian two thousand years hence will be judicious enough to prefer the evidence of contemporary fiction, and to apply to this age Dr. Johnson's saying that nature has given so much power to woman that the law cannot afford to give her more. It is unfortunate that we know so little about the woman's rights movement in fifth and fourth century Athens, and can only see its reflection in two scurrilous comedies of Aristophanes, in the "Republic" of Plato, and in the tradition that Aspasia tried to rouse Athenian wives to a sense of their oppressed condition. Aspasia, like Xanthippe, always serves to round a period. She belonged to a class that enjoyed peculiar consideration. For one Athenian wife—and she, like Xerxes, owes her vogue partly to the fact that her name begins with X and was almost indispensable to educational alphabets—we know the names and histories of half a dozen charming and witty courtesans. They at any rate were educated to discuss literature and politics with men, and so saved Athens from the reproach of those moderns for whom the salon represents the fine flower of human intercourse. Still, we need a good deal of explanation and reassurance by Platonists when we find Socrates advising one of these ladies how best to succeed in her profession.

The Greeks who settled in Egypt after the death of Alexander found there an aristocratic society in which women enjoyed a scandalous freedom, making contracts in their own names, owning property, and allowed equal legal status with their husbands. The country of the Cleopatras was not, indeed, likely to impose restrictions on women. In Rome we find the same story. Women had less acknowleged freedom under the Republic, more under the Empire. For five hundred years after the founding of Rome there was no case of divorce. But the example of Cato, that model of austere morals, who divorced his wife that she might marry a friend, and remarried her when she was enriched by the friend's death, or of Cicero, who put away his wife because he wanted a new dowry, shows that if we want to illustrate the amazing ease and frequency of Roman divorce we need not wait for the Empire. Divorce implied no disgrace, and it would be hard to parallel in America the case of the Roman matron who found herself the twenty-first wife of her twenty-third husband.

The influence of the Christian Church did more than any legal code has ever achieved to deprive women of property and liberty. It was reserved for a bishop in the sixth Christian century to decide that woman has no soul, and is therefore not a human being. It is unnecessary to dwell on the influence of St. Paul in planning the rôle of the Early Christian woman. Her part was to be the chief cause of sin, and to avoid and humiliate her was the sure mark of the saint.

The Principal of St. Andrews wrote these essays for the *Contemporary Review* many years ago, but his statements were based on sound scholarship, and were made with unusual caution, so that he could publish them in book form with the addition here and there of footnotes embodying certain modern discussions. Besides this he has added some sixty pages of loose notes on the debates that still rage about the persons of Sappho and Aspasia or the precise relation of the "Ecclesiazousæ" of Aristophanes to the "Republic" of Plato. He has not attempted to make an organic whole of the work, but it contains material that will be useful to the writer who may some day give us what so far does not exist in English—a detailed history of woman down to the sixth century A. D. Dr. Donaldson's bibliography is fairly complete, and the book has a good index.

CURRENT FICTION.

Alice-For-Short. By William De Morgan. *New York: Henry Holt & Co.*

The reviewer, who, some six months ago, was expressing his delight in "Joseph Vance," had not the courage to predict that it would give equal delight to a large number of people. He hugged to his bosom, perhaps, a sense of special privilege, and listened with surprise to the general chorus of lay praises, which was shortly to be heard, and which continued to be swelled by voices from the most improbable quarters. It was evidently foolish of him to imagine himself alone in the revolt against the modern mode of fiction, marked by a hard polish, a studied impersonality, a brilliant inconclusiveness. "Joseph Vance," with its full-blooded people, its unabashed sentiment, its life-like inconsecutiveness, its endless delightful talky-talky, won back for us fathers and grandfathers of to-day the dear atmosphere of that world of fiction in which we were reared, and which seemed almost to have become a dead and cold world. If one were to trace the origins of Mr. De Morgan's method in an ungenerous spirit, it might be made to appear a small thing. This is Dickens, that is Thackeray, yonder is a hint of the Du Maurier stepping-stone. Very well: there is no manner of doubt as to the school to which this new-old craftsman belongs; the important fact is that he belongs to it, and does not merely hang upon its heels. Of "Alice-for-short" it may be said, at least, that it is sure to retain for its author the friends which "Joseph Vance" made for him. It is not so good as its predecessor; along the same vein though it be, its ore is of inferior grade. There is no denying that Mr. De Morgan's humor now and then degenerates into mere facetiousness, or that his familiar prolixity becomes at times pure garrulousness. More than one expectant reader, to our knowledge, was rebuffed by the Dickensish extravagance of the opening chapters of "Joseph Vance"; in "Alice-for-short" the test of endurance is greatly extended. Yet one cannot help liking M. De Morgan, even when he is most trying.

The plot of this second book is much more elaborate than that of the first; opinions will probably differ as to whether or not it is a little in the way. Involving, as it does, the lapse of something like a century and a half, and devolving with the utmost imaginable leisureliness, it may well be a discommodity to the restive reader. Spooks are involved in its unravelling, hidden treasures, a jug, a ring, a manuscript—several manuscripts—and an old lady resuscitated in the nick of time after fifty years of inanition. Nothing, of course, is told straightforwardly; and when the promising moment arrives for this or that culminating scene, it is dismissed with a negligent word or two. Very likely fifty pages follow which do not advance the story by an inch; it is all very irritating and pleasant. The writer has, we should say, a sensitive conscience in the matter of plot—a desire to give the reader his money's worth of that staple—but an instinctive contempt for it for its own sake. What really interests him is his persons, and his talk about them. The setting of the story and the general situation are much like that of its forerunner—one is tempted to say progenitor. Little Alicia Kavanagh, Alice-for-short, is a sort of feminine Joseph Vance; a forlorn waif, adopted into a wealthy middle-class family, after the malodorous death of her dingy and drink-sodden parents. Her initial rescuer is a son of said family, a spectacled pseudo-artist and Bohemian, whose studio chances to be in the house supposed to be cared for by the malodorous and fated pair. Of course he marries Alice in the end; that can be foreseen from the outset by any one with half an eye; but the game is to put off that happy and obvious consummation till further notice; to strew obstacles, real or imaginary, in the path of true love, and to keep us amused in the meantime with excursions into the past and alarms in the present.

It is largely for the sake of this (eventually) happy pair that we sit so contentedly through the somewhat long performance. The other Dramatis Personæ are, with three or four exceptions, hardly more than supernumeraries, comic or other. Above all, one misses the sturdy ballast of such a figure as that of Christopher Vance. With our elaborate plot, if the leading lady and gentleman are not sufficient for us, we must content ourselves. And this plot, when one has with some pains made it out from the long series of casual conversations which are Mr. De Morgan's substitute for narrative, one may fairly keep to himself. Enough for any true Briton or cousin of Britons that it satisfactorily proves the gentle birth of Alice, the drunken tailor's daughter.

Of the story teller in the happiest aspect of his exuberant mood we cannot resist giving a single exhibit, in the form of a description of a century-old mezzotint:

It was a lady—such a lady!—As far as her head and arms went, she was inoffensive, if elegant, and seemed—more than contented with herself. But when she got to her waist, which she did very quick, as it was tucked under her chin, she began to boom, and only subsided during her stock-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings. However, elegance resumed its sway at her feet; although they would certainly have been larger had we been consulted.

The Pickwick Ladle and Other Collectors' Stories. By Winfield Scott Moody. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Mr. Moody's little sketches of two hardened bric-à-brac hunters are entirely readable and pleasant, not only for collectors, but for unenlightened persons to whom all hall-marks look much alike, and who view *orange-peel* surface, *famille rose, famille verte,* and *Sung* cloisonné as so many cryptic and meaningless terms. Each story breathes an agreeable leisure, and the thread of the Wyckoffs' adventures among the antique dealers is enriched by a shrewd characterization of the dealers themselves, from Dirck Amstell, the honest Dutchman, to a proud representative of Du Val upon Fifth Avenue. In one of the best of the stories there is a three-sided match of wit engaged in by a dealer, a newspaper man, and a railway magnate; and there can be no better example of Mr. Moody's idealism than the fact that his dealer does not come off winner. The pleasant surprise of the stories as a whole is that, treating of the infinitely small, they constantly broaden into a larger perspective. The history of a *famille rose* platter gains distinct interest when it touches upon the Peace of Portsmouth and the Chinese in New York. And, although the basis of the volume is bric-à-brac, neither old china nor old silver is for a moment allowed to obscure the picture of two ardent monomaniacs happily ravaging their New York for hidden treasure.

Prophet's Landing. By Edwin Asa Dix. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

An ingenuous rural tale, with a moral. The landing is a little village on a New England river, which has derived its name from a line of resident hereditary seers, who have for generations found honor in their own country. Whenever any crisis of the first moment has come to the nation or the community, one of them has been inspired to lift his voice for the right. The crisis in this instance is the dominance of unprincipled commercialism. The protagonist is the keeper of a village store. His father, a conscientious and amiable man, has been content with a limited field and a moderate profit, and while he lives the son, presently a partner, seems also content. After his death, however, the son is gradually moved to expand the business, at first by legitimate means and without injuring others. Eventually, as he finds himself succeeding, he becomes less scrupulous and more grasping, till by ruthless underselling, and the acquisition of special railroad privileges, he develops a department store which closes all the other shops in the village. He founds a larger establishment in a larger town, still prospers, and in time gets himself nominated for governor. Meanwhile, as one of the managers of a new local railroad, he has so manipulated the stocks as to ruin half the country-side. After his nomination the prophet calls the people together, and denounces the shopkeeper not only as an individual, but as representative of the greatest danger which the country now has to face. The culprit, who is present, acknowledges his fault, gives up his pursuit of the governorship, and determines to make restitution, as far as may be possible, for all his acts of double-dealing and oppression. A good, obvious tract, which might be more serviceable than literature of a higher order, if it could conceivably be held before the eyes of the wicked shopkeeper and the wickeder railroad man.

The Spider, and Other Tales. By Carl Ewald. Translated from the Danish by Alexander Teixeira de Mattos. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Third in a series of translations from Carl Ewald put forth by Scribners, this little book of fables deserves to be added to the permanent library of childhood. Fables they are, though in the form of studies of animal life; but they are not, like the present American type of "nature"-story, concerned with human beings masquerading as animals. Ewald's creatures are not even individualized to the point of the "Ugly Duckling." Yet though the common experience of the given type is his theme, his way of recording that experience is in one respect like Andersen's. We are all mortal, he seems to say, and there is meaning for us humans in these simple annals of spider, bee, and dragon-fly.

"Hurrah," cry the ichneumons, as they come into the world. "Now it's only a question of finding a caterpillar for our young. Each for himself, and the devil take the hindmost: such is nature's law. We are nature's police: we see to it that things keep their balance. It would be a hideous world, indeed, if it were full of caterpillars." . . . "Or of ichneumon-flies," piped the swallow, and gulped down a mouthful of them as he spoke.

Most of the lessons, if we are to take them as lessons, are stern ones; but there is no trace in the volume of the brooding melancholy which renders Andersen a not altogether desirable companion for a sensitive child.

Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1770-1772, and 1766-1769. Edited by John Pendleton Kennedy. 2 vols., Richmond.

The State Library Board of Virgina has undertaken a valuable work in the republication of the Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia from 1776 back to the first House of Burgesses of 1619, the first legislative Assembly that ever met on this continent. The first volume, containing the records from 1773 to 1776, was issued in 1905, and has already been noticed in the *Nation* of August 17, 1905. In 1906 two volumes were issued, containing the records from 1770 to 1772, and from 1766 to 1769, the latter of which has just reached the subscribers.

Each volume is furnished with a suitable Introduction by the State librarian, John P. Kennedy. That prefixed to the volume 1770-1772 notices the treaties made with the Indians for the settlement of boundary lines, and the objections made by the military men, especially by Col. George Washington, to the grant of 1,350,000 acres to the Ohio Company in the section recently ceded by the Indians to Virginia. One reason for the objection was that many grants of land to soldiers for services in the Indian wars had been made in that section. This matter was settled, however, by the Ohio Company, for "George Mercer, the agent for this company in London, writing to Washington, December 18, 1770, advised him that the 200,000 acres claimed by officers of the Virginia troops had been accepted by the company as valid, and that their rights should be respected." A matter of more general interest noticed in the Introduction is the association entered into on June 22, 1770, "by the Gentlemen of the House of Burgesses, and the Body of Merchants assembled in this City," *i. e.*, Williamsburg, forbidding the importation of many specified articles "until the act of Parliament which imposes a duty on tea, paper, glass, and painters' colours, be totally repealed, etc." The document is given in full, with the names of 164 signers; but the agreement "was not as effective as desired," as may be seen from the letter of Gov. Nelson to Lord Hillsborough of December 19, 1770.

The Introduction to each volume begins with a brief bibliography stating where original printed copies of the Journals may be found. In the bibliography of the volume just published, 1766-1769, it is stated that the Journal for 1766 was in the British Record Office; those for 1767 and 1768 were among the Board of Trade Papers of North Carolina, the former having "apparently escaped the attention of all bibliographers to date"; the only printed copy of the Journal for 1769, first session, has turned up in the Library of Congress; and for the second session of 1769 copies of the Journal exist in the Library of Congress, the Philadelphia Library Company, and the Virginia State Library. It is still true that we often search far for what lies near at hand. The Library of the Maryland Historical Society contains in one volume, printed in colonial type and bound in ancient style, Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia for 1763, May 19 to 31 (pp. 1 to 31); for 1764, October 30 to December 21 (pp. 3 to 98); for 1765, May 1 to June 1 (99 to 154); for 1766, November 6 to December 16 (3 to 77); and for 1767, March 12 to April 11 (78 to 136)—five complete sessions in all. The last two sessions of this volume correspond to the first two sessions of the volume of Journals just issued by the Virginia State Library Board. The Maryland Historical Society may, therefore, contribute something to the bibliography appearing in these volumes. The Society acquired this volume by purchase on August 7, 1880, but its previous history is unknown to the reviewer.

The year 1766 was marked by the death on May 11 of John Robinson, Speaker of the Burgesses and Treasurer of the Colony, and by the subsequent discovery of a discrepancy in his accounts amounting to over £100,000. This matter is treated at length in the Introduction, and it greatly affected the Colony. The committee appointed to examine into the state of the public treasury presented a report on April 9, 1767. The Assembly directed that the treasurer's estate be sold to meet the indebtedness. His action was regarded as a breach of trust, "but many condoned the offence upon the ground that the colony was on the verge of financial ruin."

Further treaties with the Indians in respect to lands and boundaries are no-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticed at length in this Introduction, such as those signed at Hard Labour on October 17, 1768, and at Fort Stanwix November 5, 1768.

The first session of 1769, beginning May 8, was distinguished by the passage of the noted resolutions of May 16, which caused its dissolution on the following day by Gov. Botetourt (miswritten Fauquier in the Introduction). The tenor of these four resolutions may be seen from the first one, which was as follows:

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente. That the sole right of imposing taxes on the inhabitants of his Majesty's Colony and Dominion of Virginia, is now, and ever hath been, legally and constitutionally vested in the House of Burgesses, lawfully convened according to the antient and established Practice, with the Consent of the Council, and of his Majesty, the King of Great Britain, or his Governor for the time being."

The Assembly was dissolved on May 17 in the usual curt form:

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Burgesses, I have heard of your Resolves, and augur ill of their Effect. You have made it my duty to dissolve you; and you are dissolved accordingly.

This action of the Governor did not, however, prevent the Assembly from immediately meeting under the presidency of the late Speaker as Moderator and appointing a committee to draw up regulations for the formation of a non-importation association. The full report of the committee, signed by eighty-nine of "the principal Gentlemen of the Colony then present," is given in the Introduction. After the business in hand was finished, with due courtesy toasts were drunk to the King, the Queen, and Royal Family, Lord Botetourt, a speedy and lasting union between Great Britain and her colonies, the constitutional British Liberty in America, and all true Patriots, the Supporters thereof, the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Shelburne, and Col. Barré—all being friends of America—the late Speaker, the Treasurer of the Colony, and the *Farmer and Monitor*—thus evincing the true spirit of the colony.

The editor remarks in the concluding paragraphs of his Introduction that "the strenuous life of the Assembly from the repeal of the Stamp Act to 1770 was not without its ill effects upon the Colony," and he states that "the personnel of the Burgesses remained practically the same during that period, except in the ranks of those who opposed the Stamp Act resolutions." This volume is printed in the same handsome style as the preceding, but it needs more careful proof-reading.

Sixty-five Years in the Life of a Teacher, 1841-1906. By Edward Hicks Magill, ex-President of Swarthmore College. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50 net.

Whittier, in 1873, wrote to a friend in Philadelphia: "Does thee know, I think the old Quaker settlements of Chester, Bucks, Delaware, and Lancaster Counties forty years ago were nearer the perfection of human society than anything I have since seen? . . . It is greater than St. Paul's Roman citizenship to have been born in such a community." It was from such a community that ex-President Magill came. He was born in Bucks County, in the fertile Delaware valley, in a typical Quaker family; a household sober, steadfast, and demure. His parents held the Quaker rule, and stood firmly for anti-slavery and like reforms; they were among the earlier advocates of temperance, excluding even cider from the table. The boy was taught at first in the home, then passed on to the district school, and to the ancient Friends' boarding-school at Westtown, in Chester County. His portrayal of the happy, almost arcadian, life at this renowned old academy is all too brief.

First experience in what was to be his profession came to the author at the age of sixteen, when he found himself in charge of a class in the loft of his father's wagon-house, instructing boys and girls, at three cents per day each, in the old-time studies of the period. Here amid the rustling of quill pens, and "ciphering" on slates, and other primitive activities, the young teacher laid the foundations of those methods whereby he has helped to revolutionize the art of teaching. He decided that the way to a boy's heart is not through the application of the birch or the ferrule; the generations of students of Swarthmore who have known Dr. Magill's ever-kindly governance will here recognize the man's characteristic quality. Nor does his friendly and older-brotherly manner find surer witness than in his statement, that "from the opening of the school I engaged with my pupils in games of ball, snowballing, etc., during the recess, just as one of them, but was careful to put on the serious and resolute schoolmaster's face when I rang the bell for them to reassemble." It all recalls Whittier's vivid picture of the well-loved country teacher in "Snow-Bound."

Returning to his studies after various difficulties in his earlier teaching, Dr. Magill matriculated at Yale, but in a year passed on to Brown University, his progressive spirit attracted by President Wayland's "new college system." He received his degree at Brown in 1852, and for seven happy years was principal of the Providence Classical High School. Then for eight years he served as sub-master in the Boston Latin School. The chapter on this last-named position is one of the liveliest in the book; Dr. Gardner, the able principal, was of the old-fashioned tribe of learned but lashing masters, whose methods our kindly Quaker felt not wholly disposed to follow. But from Dr. Gardner was adopted the formula of those three requisites of a good teacher which as president of Swarthmore we have often heard Dr. Magill urge upon us—first, integrity; secondly, power of control; and thirdly, knowledge of the subject to be taught.

Swarthmoreans will read with keenest interest the latter half of the volume, wherein is seen the upbuilding of the Friends' co-educational college as described by the man who more than any other has brought Swarthmore to its present condition. Very characteristic are his word portraits of his colleagues of the faculty, and his generous pictures alike of his supporters and critics on the board of managers. The modesty of the narrative, its blended humor and gravity, are characteristic of the venerable teacher who at eighty-two still possesses much of the buoyancy and sunshine that carried him through the trials incident to the presidency of a struggling young college. In 1890 he retired from his leadership, taking with him the gratitude of all Swarthmoreans, as expressed in a resolution of the board of managers, for "the ability, the diligence, the devoted enthusiasm to the college service, the faithful and zealous conduct of affairs, which for eighteen years have marked [his] administration."

Taken as a human document, this autobiography has something of the charm and flavor of the old-time Quaker journals, their unconscious wholesomeness and delightful naïveté. It is the portrait of the finer type of Quaker character still happily existent among us. The teacher who carried to his early work the precepts of a wise mother, as told in his opening pages, cultivated through life a blended spirituality and daily practical ability, which made of him, as was said of Sir Henry Wotton, "one who, living in the world, and a master of its ways and courtesies, was yet never of it."

Nelson's Encyclopædia. Edited by Frank Moore Colby and George Sandeman. Vols. XI. and XII. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

This Encyclopædia is now complete, and it is possible fairly to estimate its value as a work of reference. It may be said at the outset that the promise held out in the earlier volumes has been more than fulfilled. The later volumes are freer of errors, and in every way more carefully done than the earlier ones. This, to be sure, can be said as truly of almost every encyclopædia, and its effectiveness as a criticism naturally depends largely on the quality of the first volumes published. Specifically in regard to "Nelson's" the Americanization of the original English text on which the work is based appears to have been done with much more thoroughness and discrimination as the work progressed. And from any point of view the original English work was a good foundation to build on.

There is no question but that this Encyclopædia will take high rank as a reference work, not only because of its conciseness, and the unusual scope and number of the topics treated, but because of the really excellent quality of a large proportion of its articles. To be sure, in many instances the extreme brevity of treatment is disappointing, and even annoying, but the important omissions are few, and no work that we have seen, pretending to cover the same field, with the same limitations of space, has quite achieved its standard of accuracy and usefulness. Almost without exception, works of a similar degree of compression and comprehensiveness have entirely lacked originality; have been indeed merely boiled-down outlines of larger works, the output of a number of fluent hack writers, without any special knowledge of the subjects they are set to work upon. It is a simple matter to test and trace work of this sort by reference to older encyclopædias. An examination of "Nelson's" text shows that it largely escapes this fault, and bears every mark of originality and individuality. Without any great pretension to literary quality, there are, nevertheless, included many articles of scholarly and literary merit. There is nothing to tell who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrote each article, but the editors have provided a separate list of contributors, from which it appears that the longer articles are largely the work of specialists, or recognized authorities in their respective fields.

Specific errors have been pointed out in previous notices of the work. In general, the most obvious faults appear to be (1) too great a condensation resulting sometimes in vagueness, but oftener in a failure to bring out properly the comparative importance or real significance of facts and events, (2) a lack of proportion from which no encyclopædia is ever free, but which is here possibly more marked as a result of its bi-national origin, and (3) too great emphasis on matters of current or contemporary interest, both as to text and illustration. It should, however, be noted that this latter fact is responsible for one characteristic that in some respects adds to rather than detracts from its value; this is the unusually full treatment of topics of a popular scientific character, which will probably appeal to a majority of those who will make use of the work. The inclusion of many articles and biographies of another sort, some of which have been referred to in previous notices, cannot be so well defended. It remains to be said that the inclusion of this mass of contemporary material has apparently been accomplished without any very great sacrifice of classical, literary, or philosophical articles, although the editors expressly announce that such have been intentionally subordinated to subjects of current interest.

Nowhere, perhaps, is this subordination more strikingly shown than in the matter of illustrations. These, as we have before remarked, leaving out all questions of the appropriateness of many of them in a work of this sort, are, as a whole, poor, and the method of printing them with the text on the back—an obvious space-saving device—makes them appear even worse than they are. The maps, too, are ridiculously inaccurate, an examination showing numerous errors of location and distances, with rivers and lakes misplaced and towns and cities miles from where they ought to be. No great reliance should therefore be placed on the atlas features of the work.

The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter. By J. B. Mayor. New York: The Macmillan Co. $4.50 net.

The apparent purpose of the Cambridge scholars Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort to comment on the entire New Testament was unfortunately not realized. Even with the supplementary notes, posthumously published, of Lightfoot on the Pauline Epistles, Hort on First Peter I., 1-II., 17, and Westcott on Ephesians, great tracts remained untouched—the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, Pastoral Epistles, James, Second Peter, Jude, and Revelation. Dr. Swete, however, in his commentaries on Mark (1898), and Revelation (1906), and Dr. Mayor, in his commentary on James (1897), and in the present volume on Jude and Second Peter are ably filling up in part what is lacking in the achievement of the Cambridge school. It is characteristic of this school that questions of literary criticism are secondary to philological and textual considerations. As Dr. Swete in his commentary on the Apocalypse of John tends to minimize the profitableness of the search after literary sources, so Dr. Mayor, while conceding that Second Peter drew from Jude, thinks that it is "superfluous to consider theories which suppose Second Peter to be made up of two independent epistles." The position taken in this volume is confessedly about the same as that of Dr. Chase in his articles on Peter and Jude in Hastings's "Bible Dictionary." The position to which Dr. Mayor has come is this: Jude is prior to Second Peter, was written nearer 80 than 70 A. D., and is the work of Jude, the brother of the Lord. This theory, it may be said in passing, was regarded even by Von Soden, in 1893, as not impossible, and may be called the generally accepted conservative view. Second Peter, on the contrary, though a unity in itself, is dependent on Jude. It is not by the Apostle Peter, and the earliest possible date is 125 A. D. In the light of what has been said on the other side by Spitta, Zahn, Bigg, and Warfield (the discussion of the last-named scholar is apparently unknown to Dr. Mayor), this view, though probably correct and certainly cautious as to the date, cannot be called conservative.

The line of treatment designated in his commentary on James is followed also here. Two hundred pages of introduction and two hundred more of notes, paraphrase, and comments, preceded by the Greek text of Jude and Second Peter (founded mainly on that of Westcott and Hort) conveniently printed in parallel pages, and finally a valuable index of Greek words covering twenty-two pages, indicate the scope of the book. Like all the other works of the veteran classical philologist, his notes here are marked by sound learning and accurate scholarship.

The Persistent Problems of Philosophy. By Mary Whiton Calkins. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.50 net.

A number of books have been written on the "Problems of Philosophy"; and the title seems in some cases to have been chosen because it does not commit the author to any solution. But Professor Calkins has very definite ideas as to how problems of philosophy are to be solved. This, as the sub-title indicates, is "An Introduction to Metaphysics." It differs, however, from most introductions of the kind in that it is historical, and from most histories of philosophy in that it is critical. There are some obvious advantages in approaching the subject on its historical side. Substance is thus given to the shadow of doctrines by associating them with persons, by showing that the ideas set forth have been really entertained, and by fixing their place in the development of thought. Professor Calkins devotes nine out of her eleven chapters to the exposition and criticism of European metaphysics from Descartes to Hegel. The "conclusion" treats of contemporary philosophy, and presents the author's own doctrine. It contains also biographical sketches of the chief modern philosophers, and an excellent bibliography. In the classification of systems the author proceeds upon a metaphysical principle—the idea of substance. Systems of metaphysics are distinguished accordingly as monistic and pluralistic—that is, those in which substance is regarded as one, and those in which it is regarded as more than one. Each of these classes is subdivided. The monist may hold that substance is numerically one yet qualitatively more than one, as for example Spinoza, who conceived God to be the only substance, and yet recognized in him a qualitative plurality, an infinite number of attributes. These subdivisions are subdivided still further. It is enough here to remark that setting out with such a principle of division, the author does not find it sufficiently elastic. For while the philosophers of continental Europe, from Descartes to Wolff, made the idea of substance the starting point, those of Great Britain during the same period began with a theory of knowledge. In her scheme of classification, Professor Calkins finds it difficult to place Kant, Fichte, and Schelling; but the two last-named philosophers should undoubtedly be put with Schopenhauer and Hegel among the "numerical" monists. It is hard to make a division sufficiently comprehensive to include every kind of metaphysical theory, and yet sufficiently definite to be of value. Had the author classified the successive systems as stages in a development rather than as stationary units, she might have escaped the irregularities and inconsistencies which mar the symmetry of her work.

To expound the metaphysics of modern Europe is no light task, but Professor Calkins has accomplished it for the most part in a clear and scholarly manner. Beginners may read her "Introduction" with understanding; and even those who are weary with the confusion of metaphysical tongues will be interested in the freshness of her comment and criticism. The chapters on Descartes and Leibnitz are good examples of the way in which the history of philosophy should be written and the criticism of philosophy performed. The account given of Spinoza is faithful to the text of his writings, but shows neglect of the Jewish sources of his doctrine. The exposition of Fichte is undertaken in such sympathy with that philosopher, that it is almost dramatic. No author writing in English has surpassed Professor Calkins in giving a clear and simple interpretation of Hegel, free from the uncouth language which disfigures most Hegelian commentaries. The least satisfactory chapter is that which treats of Kant. Like many Hegelians, Professor Calkins, we think, underestimates the importance and value of the first Critique, and of the revolution effected by it. Too much emphasis is laid upon Kant's relation to Leibnitz and Wolff, and not enough emphasis upon the crisis in European philosophy that his philosophy was designed to meet. The section entitled "Criticism of Kant's Doctrine of the Necessity of the Categories" shows a strange confusion in the author's mind of universality with necessity; yet she attributes such a confusion to Kant himself. This is not the place to consider the validity of Hegel's metaphysical principles, but the author seems rather blind to their defects, considering her keen eye for flaws in the systems of Hegel's predecessors.

Professor Calkins not only criticises, but constructs, and sets forth her own doctrine with such ability that she should have a distinguished place among contemporary Hegelians. Yet while her additions to Hegel's Logic are no doubt improvements, they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are hardly sufficient to win adherents to the school from among those who will not follow the original teaching of the master. She calls her theory "Personal Idealism," and, as she frankly admits, she owes a considerable debt to Professor Royce. We cannot help thinking, however, that this speculative philosophy built upon Hegelian principles is not much better than the dogmatism of the period before Kant, from which it differs essentially only in its pronounced idealism.

The Life and Letters of Charles Russell Lowell. By Edward W. Emerson. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2 net.

Of the young men whom Massachusetts sent from the flower of her citizens to defend the integrity of the Union and the principles of the North, many came back to enjoy what they had helped to win, and by their distinctions in peace almost cast into the shade their exploits in the field. Others, who won "the great prize of death in battle," are enshrined with "ever-youthful brows" in the memories of their fellow-citizens and the monuments of Boston. The type of these, for Boston, will always be the heroic figure of Robert Shaw. But those to whom Shaw's memory is sacred must bracket with him another of the happy warriors of Boston, a man cast in the same mould, Charles Russell Lowell, the nephew of the poet-critic.

Lowell's life has already been told by the late Professor Peirce in the "Harvard Memorial Biographies." It was the wish of Mrs. Lowell, who died lately, that the editor of this volume should supplement earlier records by his sketch of Lowell's career, and with her permission his private letters are here collected. These were written first from Europe, where Lowell spent two years after leaving Harvard, in the attempt, which proved successful, to cure a weakness of the lungs. Then follow those written in the two years before the war when he was settling down to the trade of ironmaster.

The letters written from recruiting stations and from the field in Virginia, are naturally the most interesting. Lowell was a born cavalry commander, and in three years rose from the rank of captain to that of brigadier-general. He was mortally wounded, after a display of great gallantry, in the battle of Cedar Creek in the Shenandoah Valley campaign of 1864. Less than a year before that he had married Josephine Shaw, and his wife was able to spend some months of their brief married life with him at his headquarters not far from Washington. The most intimate of the letters are addressed to his wife and to his life-long friends, H. L. Higginson and John Murray Forbes of Boston. They are the letters of a man of action, whose mind is set on his individual task whatever it may be, and they reveal a character of great sweetness and courage. The charm of his personality, partly due to unusual good looks, is shown to the reader by some excellent illustrations from photographs. In battle Lowell flung himself into all the risks, and the list in the letters of horses shot under him justified his men in believing that he bore a charmed life. Had he survived the victory of Cedar Creek, Sheridan had intended to make him his Chief of Cavalry, a position in which he would have been much less exposed. Lowell might then have lost the peculiar aureole that clings to the young soldier who does not come back from the war, and these letters would never have been published. As it is they are a touching prelude to the tragedy of early death. They bring home to us the situation, at once so glorious and so cruel, of those who have given their best to their country and receive in return the right to count a hero among their dead. They leave in the reader's mind a sting like that left by Pericles when he said in his Funeral Speech for those who had fallen in the first year of the war with Sparta: "The city has lost its youth; the year has lost its spring."

Science.

Makers of Modern Medicine. By James J. Walsh. New York: Fordham University Press. $1.

Books in English on the history of medicine are not as yet so numerous that this one, by a professor of the Fordham University Medical School, may not find a welcome. Much of the matter has already been used in articles contributed to magazines which circulate in rather special circles. Dr. Walsh has drawn from many sources, not always judiciously (certainly not judicially). These sources are often so insufficiently indicated that it is not easy to verify the statements that flow freely from his facile, sometimes almost too facile, pen. The list of "makers" will hardly satisfy all readers, to many of whom Bichat, for example, will seem too great an intellectual force to be neglected, but the sketches of the chosen ones are smooth and pleasant reading, barring a too insistent assertion that they are mostly the product of the direct influence of the Catholic Church. The effort to show that they were "all deeply religious men," in the sense that the author seems to use the phrase, is at best rather labored.

Dates are a necessary and often tiresome evil in biography, but this book would be much improved if they were a little more numerous. In about half the sketches it is difficult to place many important events in the lives or even to tell the death year of the subject. A careful comparison of dates would refute the dictum of the author that practically every great discovery in medicine has been made by men under thirty-five and show that here as elsewhere the tree of knowledge bears many fruits, some of which ripen slowly. A little attention to chronology would also have prevented the confusing statement (p. 123) concerning Galvani, that "in his observations on the effects of lightning he was forestalling Franklin's work to some extent." If this refers to the kite and related experiments, it may be said that Franklin's kite flew at least twenty-eight, possibly nearer thirty-eight, years before the frogs of Galvani twitched, and also at a time when Galvani was not quite fifteen years old! It may further be noted that Richmann was killed by lightning *not* "not long after this time [of Galvani's experiment, 1780-90 (?)]," but many years earlier, to wit, in 1753.

The author also promises a volume dealing with the medical men of earlier centuries, back to the fifteenth. It will be interesting to see how he treats them; there were giants in those days.

George Massee, whose interesting treatise on fungi was noticed in the *Nation* of December 20, 1906, has published a very practical handbook upon a restricted portion of the larger field, namely, the fungal vegetable parasites. This "Text-book of Plant Diseases" (The Macmillan Co.) considers only those maladies of plants which are caused by cryptogamic parasites, leaving untouched the great group of diseases due to defects of nutrition and the like. Mr. Massee gives clear directions for combating some of these maladies, so that his work must be of use to intelligent cultivators who wish to keep abreast of the times. The greater part of the subject-matter of his treatise is presented likewise in a practical form by our progressive and untiring Department of Agriculture in its Bulletins. The Department of Agriculture and the different experiment stations in our country are leaving no part of this subject untouched. But it is well for all cultivators to have a synoptic handbook like Mr. Massee's within reach. For Americans it is well to note that a few changes in terminology are necessary, for instance, our word kerosene must be substituted for paraffin (p. 40).

Prof. D. G. Elliot has prepared a "Catalogue of the Collection of Mammals in the Field Columbian Museum" of Chicago, giving under each species the scientific name with synonyms and the common name; also under each specimen the age, sex, locality, and collector. The number of mammals in the collection has increased from a few mounted specimens when Professor Elliot took charge, to 15,000 at the present day. A new species of bat is described, and ninety drawings illustrate some of the lesser known mammalian forms. (Published by the Museum.)

The Société d'Astronomie d'Anvers has just issued its second annual report. Chiefly founded for the purpose of popularizing the study of Astronomy among the inhabitants of the town, the society would appear to be fulfilling its purpose remarkably well. An observatory has been opened, and is used regularly by the members; and, assisted by the city authorities, a course of free lectures is maintained.

F. R. L. Wilson and G. R. Hedley's laboratory manual, "Elementary Chemistry" (Henry Frowde), does not differ in any essential respect from a hundred others. In choosing a laboratory guide the instructor will be influenced chiefly by its adaptation to his text-book, his laboratory facilities, and his allotment of time; therefore, he will be apt to find some American manual which will fit him better than this English one.

Drama.

CLYDE FITCH AS A DRAMATIST.

William Archer, one of the most observant and generally judicious of English theatrical critics, recently pointed to Clyde Fitch as the most striking example of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advance made by American dramatists. He would have been more accurate if he had described him as the most successful and conspicuous of American playwrights. Mr. Fitch's claim to that title will scarcely be disputed. Since 1891 he has produced more than thirty plays, of which at least two-thirds are supposed to have been highly remunerative, but box-office prosperity, it is needless to say, is no infallible proof of artistic merit. Nevertheless, it does afford presumptive evidence of some uncommon ability on the part of the author in the adaptation of means to ends, and now that negotiations are reported to be in progress for the performance of one of Mr. Fitch's latest comedies in France, Germany, and Italy, it may be interesting to make a swift review of his product in order to get some idea of its actual dramatic value.

This, in comparison with the great bulk of his writings, will be found to be almost inconsiderable. It is only by virtue of two or three pieces, to be specified presently, and a few isolated scenes, that he can be considered—in the proper sense of that much abused word—a dramatist at all. Drama implies purpose, design, the study of human nature, the conflict of antagonistic characters, the logical development of effects from causes, the illustration of eternal principles, the embodiment of truth in action. It concerns itself more in the invisible forces that dominate events than with the events themselves. Mr. Fitch's plays, with very few exceptions, are mere arrangements, more or less dexterous, of incidents designed to amuse or startle, without reference to character, motive, truth, or moral. In external detail they are often veracious, after the manner of a photographic snapshot, being indeed mimetic rather than inventive, but their composition as a rule, is arbitrary, extravagant, illogical, and insignificant.

Some of his earlier plays, such as "The Masked Ball," "An American Duchess," "Gossip," and "Bohemia," adaptations or collaborations, need not be taken into consideration. The extent of his responsibility for them is uncertain. Nor is it necessary to the present object to discuss such ephemeral affairs as "Mistress Betty" (1895)—a grotesque extravagance dignified by the genius of Modjeska—"The Moth and the Flame" (1898)—social functions, interspersed with lurid melodrama—"The Head of the Family" (1898), "The Cowboy and the Lady" (1899), "Lovers' Lane" (1901), "The Way of the World" (1901)—a silly social shocker—"The Girl and the Judge" (1901)—clever, amusing, but tricky, irrational, and shallow—"The Stubbornness of Geraldine" (1902), "The Frisky Mrs. Johnson" (1903), "Her Own Way" (1903), "The Coronet of the Duchess" (1904), "Cousin Billy" (1905), or half-a-dozen others of even less consequence. They were not all devoid of merit by any means. Most of them were theatrically effective; showed a sharp sense of situation, and a capacity for glib, flashy, witty, or satirical dialogue; furnished excellent copies of familiar types, and provided fairly good and varied entertainment but all were marred by extravagance, sensationalism, flippancy, obvious absurdity, or utter triviality. Not one had any dramatic weight or substance. This last remark applies with special force to three adaptations, "Sapho" (1900), a gross vulgarization of Daudet's tale; "The Marriage Game" (1901), a crude version of "Le Mariage d'Olympe," and "The Bird in the Cage" (1903), which were as maladroit in execution as they were abominable in tone.

Of his modern social plays several are entitled to more respectful consideration. In "The Climbers" (1901), with all its excess of melodramatic device—the funeral scene, the confession in the dark, etc.—there was a foundation of truth and purpose, with some effective satire, honest emotion, and realistic sketches of character. But the dramatic value of it was destroyed by the conventionality of a happy ending secured by a suicide. "The Girl with Green Eyes" (1902), originating in a useful dramatic idea, is brightly written, neatly constructed, and contains several striking theatrical situations, but these are obtained only by the sacrifice of almost every probability. Here again the solution of a moral dilemma is evaded by the tamest convention. "The Woman in the Case" (1905), an effort in "realistic" melodrama, is superior to other pieces of its class only in the mechanical cleverness exhibited in its construction. It illustrates the waste of trained skill upon worthless material. "The Straight Road" (1907) belongs to the same category, but is not so well made, though more honest in treatment. "The Truth" (1907) is a mixture of light comedy and sentimental drama, in which a promising character study, developed in spots with much cleverness, is reduced to the verge of absurdity by the author's chronic lack of artistic moderation.

It is only in his remotely historical plays that Mr. Fitch exhibits some of the design and purpose of the genuine dramatist. In his "Beau Brummel" (1890), juvenile and faulty as it is in many respects, the attempt to reproduce the manners and personages of a bygone era is creditable and not altogether unsuccessful. The dying scene is a bit of apt and pathetic fancy. His "Nathan Hale" (1899), rather feeble in design and overladen with trivial matter, is redeemed by a simple and dignified closing scene. "Barbara Frietchie" (1899) shows fertility in the invention of incident, and is, on the whole, an excellent specimen of stage fiction, in general harmony with the assigned period. Many of the incidents, especially the most emotional, are flagrantly theatrical, but the play is meritorious in intent, if not in execution. "Major André" (1903) in general design and sustained quality is, perhaps, the best of Mr. Fitch's achievements up to date. It plays havoc with actual history, and occasionally sacrifices common sense to theatrical trickery, but in the main it is ingenious, sympathetic, atmospherically veracious, and capable. The closing scene is tender, dignified, and poetically imaginative.

This record does not offer much encouraging evidence of development, except in the matter of technical skill. In the invention and presentation of theatrical incident, comic or melodramatic, Mr. Fitch has always been proficient, and practice has made him more skilful in this respect, but, except in the rarest instances, his personages have been mere puppets, made to fit the desired situation. He is an expert in converting current gossip into living pictures. He can copy an individual, but cannot create a type. Circumstance is always his god in the machine. The influence of character upon the order of events rarely enters into his calculations. In all his plays it would be difficult to find one man or woman of moral or intellectual distinction. He alternates between frivol and sensation. He is one of the most adroit of our entertainers, but he can scarcely be called our representative dramatist, while Bronson Howard, author of "Aristocracy" and "The Banker's Daughter," Vaughan Moody, Charles Klein, and Percy Mackaye remain in the field.

Music.

The copyright for Great Britain and the British colonies of a large number of MacDowell's compositions was acquired some time ago by Elkin & Co. of London, who report a steadily increasing sale of these works. In one respect London is even ahead of New York, for at a recent concert George F. Boyd played the Keltic sonata, which has not been done publicly in this city. At the same concert, the *Standard* says, Miss Grainger-Kerr sang "some charming examples of the lyric art of the American composer, MacDowell, which she interpreted most artistically."

The late Charles James Oldham of London was a well-known collector of violins. He owned, among other instruments, four excellent ones by Stradivarius, undoubtedly genuine. In his will he left one of these to the state, unless a purchaser can be found willing to pay $15,000 for it. The date of this instrument is 1690, and it was sold in 1888 for $5,000. Another of the Oldham violins, valued at $5,000, he bequeathed to the British Museum. Not a few foreign journals have taken this occasion to inveigh once more against the "stupid egotism" and "criminal mania" of rich violin collectors, who prevent the musical public from enjoying the finest instruments in existence.

While in Paris recently to conduct his "Salome," Richard Strauss gave to a journalist a brief sketch of his career and a confession of faith. He began to compose when he was only ten years old. Five years later his first symphony was performed in Munich, under Levy. Six years after that, Hans von Bülow put him at the head of an orchestra. Among the composers who first influenced him were Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert; but above all, Mozart. He was eighteen when he first felt the spell of the music of Wagner and Liszt, as well as Berlioz, and these three men became thenceforth his models. He said, in speaking of Berlioz:

> In the main, I endeavored to derive from French music those things which are most wanting in the German, certain airy, graceful, charming *finesses*, as exemplified particularly in the score of "Carmen," which presents such a strong contrast to the serious heavy style from which the German composers find it so difficult to get away.

Strauss did not seem to realize that no German composer is quite as many miles away from the "airy, graceful, charming *finesses*" of "Carmen" as he himself. Regarding his new opera, "Electra," he said that two acts are already completed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There was a time when the guitar was the most popular of parlor instruments, especially for accompanying songs. Most of Weber's Lieder were written with guitar accompaniment. Of late there has been a decided reaction in its favor in Germany. It started with the concerts of the Swede, Sven Scholander, who used a lute which really was a kind of guitar, with hollowed back. To-day there is quite a demand for guitars and guitar music. No doubt the revival of interest in folk-song has something to do with this; for folk-songs sound better with guitar than with piano accompaniment.

The latest history of music in German is by F. Spiro. It is thoroughly unconventional. He calls Clara Schumann "a piano gosling," and says that Brahms is "the typical representative of the industrious German middle class."

All records have been beaten in Vienna by the operetta "Die Lustige Witwe" (the Merry Widow), which has been sung there consecutively more than 400 times. The four-hundredth performance was the occasion for a great ovation to the composer, Herr Lehar, and all the singers.

Art.

Antonio Pollaiuolo. By Maud Crutwell. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $2 net.

In a brief prefatory note Miss Crutwell states that "this is the first book devoted to Antonio Pollaiuolo that has been published in any language," and acknowledges her indebtedness to Bernhard Berenson's study of the Pollaiuoli, in his "Florentine Drawings of the Renaissance," as to the chief, and almost the only, writing of importance on the subject. Ever since Vasari made certain demonstrable blunders in his account of the brothers, the works of Antonio have been so confused with those of Piero, and both with the works of others, that it was apparently reserved for Mr. Berenson to make a beginning in disentangling the two individualities, and in demonstrating that Antonio was a great artist and his younger brother little more than a not very competent assistant. This task Miss Crutwell has now taken up and carried into greater detail, differing with Mr. Berenson now and then on this or that minor matter, as was to be expected, but carrying out her work on the large lines laid down by him. Her study is careful, intelligent, for the most part excellent. Its faults arise from a too great admiration for her hero, which leads her into frequent exaggeration of praise and, finally, into what we are inclined to regard as a grave error.

However careless or untrustworthy as to matters of fact Vasari may have been, he was an excellent critic, and his praise is usually both intelligent and just. His estimate of Antonio is nearly perfect:

> He understood the nude in a more modern way than any of the masters before him. . . . He was the first to study the play of the muscles and their form and order in the body.

That is a very precise definition of the quality of the master. He was a man of scientific and realistic temper, little concerned with beauty or sentiment, interested in mastering the human figure and in expressing its substance and its movement, the pathfinder for the glorious masters who came after him. But Miss Crutwell is not content with rating him as one who "understood the nude in a more modern way than any before him"; she will have it that he understood it better than any one before or since. "Not even Signorelli nor Michelangelo have equalled him," she says; certain works she calls "worthy of the sculptor of the Parthenon reliefs"; and of the reliefs on the tomb of Sixtus IV. she remarks: "Never has the female nude been at once so exquisitely and so scientifically modelled," and "certainly no other sculptor has combined so exquisitely its possibilities of grace and strength." Her text is full of allusions to his "faultless drawing," his "faultless anatomy," his "perfect proportions." Now all this is, asking pardon for the rudeness of the phrase, arrant nonsense. Antonio Pollaiuolo never did a faultless figure in his life, nor anything like one. In drawing, engraving, painting, sculpture, he produced many figures. Energetic they are, vital, full of force and movement and life, but faultless is what they are not. They are rather ungainly, ill proportioned, ugly. Now and then they approach beauty, but now and then only, and perfection they never touch.

Such excess of enthusiasm is, however, not unknown in other monographs, and in itself is harmless enough. Most readers will be able to supply the necessary grain of salt. But this ill-regulated admiration has led Miss Crutwell to a conception of the relations between the two brothers, and of their respective share in the work undertaken jointly by them, which we find quite incredible. Ardently admiring Antonio, and having little but contempt for Piero, she must needs give to the elder everything of good in their joint works, and to the younger everything faulty. So, when she finds the mirror and serpent in the hands of the Prudence of the Mercantanza better executed than the figure, instead of reasoning, as Berenson does of the background of the Annunciation, that this is just the kind of thing an inferior man could execute well, she concludes that Antonio painted these details himself. She likes the landscape backgrounds, with the Arno winding through its valley and under the walls of Florence, which occur in many of the pictures of the Pollaiuoli, and concludes that Antonio painted these, even when they are incidental glimpses through a window in the background of a composition showing, otherwise, no touch of his hand. She has reduced all this to a theory and propounds it categorically. "He seems in all their joint work to have reserved to himself only such parts as interested him," and that he was specially interested in landscape "is proved by the fact that, while leaving to Piero the principal figures in his pictures, he himself painted with the care of a miniaturist the background scenery." We are asked, in a word, to believe that the greatest figure draughtsman of his age (or, as we are told, of any age), a man of fiery energy, a student of anatomy, who dissected many cadavers and who valued subjects only as they afforded opportunity for displaying the nude in violent action, a goldsmith by training, a sculptor by preference, amused himself by painting "with the care of a miniaturist" bits of landscape between the legs of figures drawn by an incompetent younger brother! One can as easily imagine Michelangelo doing the same thing.

Surely, a more rational theory of the collaboration of the two Pollaiuoli than this must be attainable. Without pretending to the perilous honors of modern connoisseurship, with no facilities for the proper study of the works involved, relying only upon the data afforded by Miss Crutwell herself and by Mr. Berenson, and the reproductions published by them, we are tempted to suggest an alternative hypothesis which may be worthy of investigation by some one competent for the task. That hypothesis is, in brief, that Piero was the landscape painter of the family, that the characteristic view of the Val d'Arno appears only in works in which he had a share, and that it is uniformly executed by him.

There is certainly no inherent improbability in the notion that the inferior figure-painter should be the superior in landscape, and there is nothing in what we know of the character of the two brothers to negative the supposition that the placid distances, which contrast so strongly with the savage energy of the figures in front of them, were the work of the weaker and milder man. Miss Crutwell dwells upon the striking difference in type of the portraits upon their tomb in San Pietro in Vincoli, comparing Antonio's head to those of Mantegna and Signorelli. It reminds us of that of Ingres also, with its great nose, its high cheek bones, its forcefulness, and its austerity; and it reminds us, more than all, as Mantegna and Ingres often do, of some aged Indian chief. But for the broken nose and the beard, which disguise the resemblance, Michelangelo had a head of the same family—the typical head of the severe masters of form. Piero's is as different as possible—"timid and fretful," Miss Crutwell calls it, "with its weak mouth and vacillating expression"; mild, certainly, and somewhat sentimental, gentle, and with a vague, brooding look about the eyes, gazing off into the distance with a dreamy look altogether in contrast with Antonio's concentrated glance. It might well be the head of some modern lover of nature in her sweeter moods; it could never be the head of a great draughtsman.

All this may be purely fanciful, however, and proves nothing. Let us consider some concrete facts. And first, note the almost entire absence of distance, or even of what may be called a background, in the works that are accepted as entirely by Antonio's own hand and as most characteristic of his genius. The frescoes of the Villa della Gallina, in the grounds of the Torre del Gallo, Arcetri, near Florence, are much dilapidated and repainted, but they seem never to have had anything but a flat tone behind the figures, which detach themselves against it in a pattern of nude forms much as an antique sculptor would have designed a frieze. Such is the treatment, also, of the drawing in the British Museum of a Prisoner Brought before a Judge, the figures in almost pure outline, relieved against a flat wash which represents nothing—the plane surface of the sculptor in relief. In the Battle of Ten Nudes we see

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the goldsmith, the ornamentalist, the worker in niello, rather than the sculptor. The background is a closely interwoven thicket of trees and vines treated in a wholly conventional manner, a piece of intricate decoration rather than a representation of nature; and the whole plate is, with evident intention, kept entirely flat and without suggestion of distance. This is Antonio's method when he is entirely free to do as he chooses—to leave the background out entirely or to make of it a mere pattern. When he has to tell a story he must give it a setting, and his designs for embroidery, where Piero probably assisted him, have glimpses of landscape, rigidly subordinated, however, to the figures. Whenever it is at all possible, he substitutes architecture for landscape, and treats it in a very formal way. So, in the relief for the silver altar, there is the necessary architectural setting in the tradition of Ghiberti, though he seems never to have attempted landscape in bronze as Ghiberti did; but in his most mature and most magnificent work, the tombs of Sixtus IV. and Innocent VIII., he returns to the purely sculpturesque tradition, and his reliefs have no perspective and no distance. Only something rudely symbolical of rocks suggests that some of the figures are supposed to be out of doors.

Of the paintings attributed to Antonio alone, two are supposed by Miss Crutwell to be so early as to exclude Piero's collaboration, the David of the Berlin Museum and the Apollo and Daphne of the National Gallery. If the latter is really as early as she thinks it, our suggestion is disproved. But the David, striding over the head of Goliath, is painted "against a slate-gray wall." The earliest picture in which she recognizes, as does every one, the hand of Piero, is the SS. James, Vincent, and Eustace, painted in 1466, when he was about twenty-three years old. Two of the figures certainly, all of them possibly, are partly or entirely by Piero. Between them are narrow strips of landscape, a few inches wide, the characteristic Pollaiuolo landscape with its winding stream. We meet it constantly after this, nowhere more characterized than in the glimpse of distance seen through the window behind the Annunciation, a picture in which not even Miss Crutwell finds any other trace of Antonio's hand. The S. Mary of Egypt, however, at Staggio, which she believes to be entirely by Antonio, has a different style—a rocky cave as purely symbolical and antinatural as a background of Giotto's. It is true that there seems to be a bit of distance, in the left hand lower corner, which resembles the Val-d'Arno landscape we are familiar with, but less well done than usual—if Antonio was indeed dispensing with his brother's assistance on this occasion, he may have done it carelessly himself.

But the crux of the argument is to be found in the two little pictures of Hercules and the Hydra and Hercules and Antæus, now in the Uffizi, and their relation to the large pictures of the same subjects known to have been painted for Lorenzo di Medici in 1460 by Antonio, with the assistance of Piero, then a youth of seventeen. The small panels are considered by Berenson to be preliminary studies for the large pictures, but Miss Crutwell argues, very successfully, that they are independent versions, thinking it likely, however, that they were painted "about the same time"; and she goes on: "They belonged to the Medici collection, probably to Lorenzo himself, and it may be that he valued them so highly as to order them to be copied on a larger scale." In either view the little panels would be earlier than the lost pictures with which they are connected. Why should they not be later, free replicas made for some other member of the Medici family from the large canvas belonging to Lorenzo? Miss Crutwell's arguments for the independent nature of the smaller pictures seem to us to point to this conclusion, although she does not draw it. Her reasons are these:

Among the engravings of Robetta are two, of the Labors of Hercules, which have been generally accepted as copies of the small panels, but which differ from them in many points, and which seem likely to be copies of the lost pictures, as Robetta would be unlikely to make such grave changes himself, or variations so much in the manner of Antonio's own work. In the Antæus there is a strange figure of a child which has no apparent reason for being there, and which we can hardly conceive of as added by a copyist. The figure of Antæus himself is awkwardly arranged, without any foreshortening of the limbs, and is altogether more primitive in manner than in the little panel. In the Combat with the Hydra there are also several variations, notably in the pose of Hercules's left hand (which does not grasp the Hydra's neck, but is only stretched out toward it), in the less happy composition of the lion-skin, and in the drawing of the Hydra itself, and most of these differences are supported by an old drawing in the Louvre and by Antonio's own sketch in the British Museum. What Miss Crutwell does not note is that the pose of the left hand in the engraving, bent back upon the wrist in a peculiar manner, is strikingly characteristic of Antonio, occurring in his drawing of Adam in the Uffizi, in two of the figures in the Prisoner brought before a Judge, and in the Torre del Greco frescoes. But all these differences are slight compared to those in the backgrounds. In the little pictures the figures are posed, in the characteristic Pollaiuolesque way, upon a foreground eminence, with no middle distance, and loom large against a distant landscape with a winding stream, upon which we look down as from a height. In the engravings everything is different—there is nothing but shapeless dumpling-like masses of rock, piled so high, in the Combat with the Hydra, as utterly to dwarf the figure, and pierced with a cave somewhat resembling that of S. Mary of Egypt.

All of these differences are in favor of the smaller pictures as the more mature and well-considered works, but this is especially true of the difference of background. It is inconceivable that the painter who had once made his figures tower against the distance as these do should afterward substitute the clumsy lumpiness which stands for the earth in the engravings. In our view, then, the small panels were painted some few years after the large pictures, and the figures were revised and improved by Antonio himself. In the backgrounds he let Piero, who had already, as we know, some slight share in the larger works, try his hand, and, being pleased with the result, called him in thereafter when landscape was to be treated, though he did without landscape when he could. The background of the Hercules and Antæus would thus be probably the earliest of Piero's attempts at the painting of distant landscape, that of the Hercules and the Hydra being already somewhat more mature, though neither of them is equal to what he afterwards did in pictures otherwise very inferior.

One difference between the two versions of the latter subject we have failed to note. In the engraving, as in Antonio's sketch, the club of Hercules "breaks out in flame," as Miss Crutwell, following Mr. Berenson, expresses it—in other words, he wields the burning brand with which, if we remember aright, he seared the Hydra's necks to prevent the heads from growing out again. Was it from negligence, or as a concession to the common notion of Hercules, that, in the smaller version, this detail was omitted and a plain club substituted for the flaming one?

In "Stories of the Italian Artists" (E. P. Dutton & Co.) E. L. Seely pretends to give no more than a translation of the best narrative parts of Vasari without notes or corrections of that writer's misstatements. As such, its utility to-day may be doubted, but it may, of course, afford innocent amusement. The book is handsomely printed, and the illustrations, including eight in colors, are well executed. In the more primitive work, especially, the addition of color is a real help to understanding; in the more advanced work the gain is doubtful, the coloring of advanced painters not being at all imitable by the processes used. The text is "wholly revised from a previous publication."

The death of Prof. Carlo Ferrario, at the age of seventy-three, is announced from Milan. Professor Ferrario had for many years been teacher of perspective at the Brera Academy. He was himself a distinguished painter.

Finance.

"SHORT CROPS" AND PROSPERITY.

Attention has already been called, in this column, to the jeopardy in which the season's abnormal weather has placed the grain crops, not only of this country, but of the entire world. The controversy as to probable results is not yet over, and probably will not be over until the late wheat crop of the Northwest has passed through the trial of the autumn frosts. Meantime, "private estimates" have been given out by experts attached to speculative grain houses; one of such estimates, not very long since, declared that the winter-sown wheat crop of the Southwest and Middle States could not yield more than 325,000,000 bushels. This would compare with 405,000,000 bushels deduced from the Government's "condition estimate" of May 10, and with 492,000,000 actually harvested last year.

That private estimate came on a market where speculation for the rise had been overdone, and it found few believers. Generally, it was felt in the trade that,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

although the crop weather since May 10 has by no means been of the best, still it has improved on that of the preceding month; indeed, since the estimate in question was published, the price of wheat for July delivery has declined 6 cents per bushel. On Tuesday of this week, the Ohio State Agricultural Department, which at the opening of May gave out a winter wheat condition estimate of 74, marked up the figure to 77.

Next Monday, the national Department of Agriculture will submit its June report on the country's winter-wheat crop as a whole, and this will in some respects be the last word on the actual present situation. If the estimate is raised from the 82.9 per cent. to which it was reduced from the 89.9 of April, apprehensions will be definitely relieved. Of still greater importance will be the Department's estimate of the same date on the "spring wheat crop" of the northerly Middle States and the farther Northwest. The difficulty of planting grain in the cold and stormy weather of May—during which month all the later wheat ought to be placed underground—has led to apprehensions of an acreage much reduced from last year's 17,354,000 acres spring wheat area, of a "condition" far below the excellent showing of 93.4 in June, 1906, and consequently of a crop promise 100,000,000 bushels or more below the 242,700,000 harvested in those States last year.

The verdict on these two crops we shall know four days from now; meanwhile, the extraordinary weather has had its influence in other directions. The cold storms happened to come at the very hour when the cotton crop of the Southern States was planting. From Texas to North Carolina, the fortnight between May 1 and May 15 usually sees the completion of planting; this year, no such dates could be observed. Southern correspondents of an important cotton organ have declared this to be the most "backward" of cotton seasons since 1855.

From a price of not quite 12 cents a pound, on May 14, cotton advanced at New York, by the 31st, to 12⅞—a higher price than any reached since the famous "Sully corner" of January, 1904. Alarming estimates of probable shortage in the crop—put out, as usual, in the interest of speculative houses—at once became current. The Government's first "cotton condition estimate" of the season was to appear last Tuesday, June 4; three or four days earlier, the "private experts" of the Cotton Exchange pressed matters to a climax by publishing a condition percentage estimate of 63.4. What such a condition would mean may be judged by comparison with the June estimates of previous years. The lowest figure named by the Government this month, in a quarter of a century, was more than 10 per cent. above it. The Cotton Exchange, taking its cue from this absurd guess of an irresponsible calculator, framed expectations of its own ranging from 60 per cent. to 68. The Government's Tuesday estimate named 70½ per cent., and down came the inflated price of cotton.

But 70½ is still a very low June indication, precisely as was the 82.9 for winter wheat. No June estimate in twenty-five years has been so unfavorable; it is 14 per cent. below last June's. The acreage is unchanged, according to the Government, and less than 5 per cent. larger according to the most trustworthy trade publication; therefore, if the June promise were to hold good, a crop one-half to three-quarters of a million bales below last year's might be expected, and this would probably fall short of the cotton manufacturing world's normal requirements. It is, however, entirely too early to make such a prediction, since the very fact that cotton was hardly planted, at the time of the Government estimate, means that the Department of Agriculture's figures were imperfect. With good growing weather from now forward, the plant which was not above ground at last month's close ought to be in better condition than the plant which was. Still, the fact must be recognized that with cotton, as with wheat, existing circumstances are not favorable. Exactly what, then, would a general shortage of our grain and cotton crops mean to the American situation?

Next to the probably lessened purchasing power of the people, the most immediate effect would be on the country's export trade. In 1906, when all the crops were large, we exported $107,000,000 worth of wheat and flour, and no less than $412,600,000 worth of cotton. Our total merchandise exports of that year were $1,798,000,000; so that these two great staples made up very nearly one-third of the entire outward trade. Now it does not necessarily follow that a diminished crop would reduce this showing disastrously. In the case of cotton, for instance, the crop of 1903 was wholly inadequate for the needs of the world's manufacturers; yet Europe, whose own supply was very low, and which had to have the cotton, paid such prices for it that, although our exports from the crop were 657,000 bales below those from the crop of 1902, the value of the exports was actually $66,000,000 larger. But this was exceptional. The wheat shortage of 1904 had a very different outcome; it cut that year's breadstuffs exports down no less than $100,000,000. In the case of cotton in 1903, the crop, though deficient for the full needs of the world, gave enough to spare a larger number of bales for export than in any year prior to 1898. In the wheat market of 1904, we had so little left over, after providing for the needs of American consumers, that the number of bushels exported was much the smallest since 1869.

When one asks, how such influences would operate, in case of a serious crop shortage this year, the answer is not at all easy. Europe's requirements, from our short cotton crop of 1903, were unusually urgent—a series of more or less deficient harvests had depleted the stock in every manufacturer's hands. The present situation is not quite analogous. Since 1903, the world has raised two cotton crops of unparalleled magnitude; last week, the world's "visible supply" was a million and a half bales greater than at this time four years ago. With wheat, on the other hand, the case of 1904 was that Russia increased its own crop almost exactly in proportion to our shortage, so that the world's needs were provided for, notwithstanding the American deficiency. When Chicago raised the price of American wheat, Europe simply ceased bidding. But, so far as appearances indicate to-day, Europe's own wheat crop of 1907 is likely to be quite as deficient as our own, and may possibly turn out much more so. In other words, foreign needs for our cotton are likely this year to be much smaller than in 1903, and foreign needs for our wheat much larger than in 1904.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Benson, Edward White. God's Board. Dutton. $1.25 net.
Bishop, Emily M. Seventy Years Young. B. W. Huebsch. $1.20 net.
Breare, W. H. Vocal Faults and their Remedies. Putnams.
Butler, Nicholas Murray. True and False Democracy. Macmillan Co. $1 net.
Cambridge Modern History. Vol. X. Macmillan Co. $4 net.
Campbell, Wilfred. Canada. Macmillan Co. $6 net.
Cruthwell, Maud. A Guide to the Paintings in the Florentine Galleries. Dutton. $1.25 net.
Ditchfield, P. H. The Parish Clerk. Dutton. $2.50 net.
Dunraven, Earl of. The Outlook in Ireland. Dutton. $3 net.
Düring, Stella M. Disinherited. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
Fiske, John. Essays, Historical and Literary. Macmillan Co. $3 net.
Forel, August. Hygiene of Nerves and Mind in Health and Disease. Translated by Herbert A. Aikins. Putnams.
Fraser, John Foster. Red Russia. John Lane Co. $1.75 net.
Gordon, E. O. Saint George. Imported by Dutton. $5 net.
Green, Mrs. J. R. Town Life in the Fifteenth Century. Macmillan Co. $4 net.
Hampson, W. Paradoxes of Nature and Science. Dutton. $1.50.
Hill, Headon. The Avengers. B. W. Dodge & Co.
Jeremias, Alfred. Die Panbabylonisten der Alte Orient und die Aegyptische Religion. Leipzig.
Jordan, David Starr. The Philosophy of Hope. Paul Elder & Co. 75 cents net.
Langfield, Millard. Introduction to Infectious and Parasitic Diseases. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston's Son & Co. $1.25 net.
Lees, Dorothy Neville. Scenes and Shrines in Tuscany. Dutton. $1.25 net.
Luce, Robert. Writing for the Press. Boston: Clipping Bureau Press.
Macklin, Herbert W. The Brasses of England. Dutton. $2.50 net.
Miles, George Henry. Said the Rose and other Lyrics. Longmans. $1 net.
Montesquieu's Lettres Persanes. Preface by E. Faguet. Putnams.
Morgan, Wm. De. Alice-for-short. Henry Holt & Co.
Murray, A. M. Imperial Outposts. Dutton. $3.50 net.
Phyfe, William Henry P. Napoleon. Putnams.
Pierson, Clara Dillingham. The Millers at Pencroft. Dutton. $1.
Plummer, Mary Wright. Roy and Ray in Mexico. Henry Holt & Co.
Price, George B. Gaining Health in the West. B. W. Huebsch. $1 net.
Richardson, Frank. 2835 Mayfair. London: T. Werner Laurie.
Scott, Robert Forsyth. St. John's College, Cambridge. Dutton. 75 cents net.
Sheppard, Alfred Tresidder. Running Horse Inn. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
Thomas, Paul. Le Droit de Propriété des Laïques sur les Églises et Le Patronage Laïque au Moyen Age. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Toutain, J. Les Cultes Païens *dans l'Empire* Romain. Tome I. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Tuker, M. A. R. Cambridge. Macmillan Co.
Wallace, Helen. The Sons of the Seigneur. Outing Publishing Co. $1.50.
Warren, T. Herbert. Magdalen College, Oxford. Dutton. 75 cents net.
Whipple, Leander Edmund. Practical Health. Metaphysical Publishing Co. $1.50 net.
Willcocks, M. P. The Wingless Victory. John Lane Co. $1.50.
Young, Janet. Psychological Year Book. Paul Elder & Co. 50 cents net.

Two Novels Fit for Nation Readers

ALICE-FOR-SHORT

By WILLIAM DE MORGAN,

Author of "Joseph Vance."

A novel of English life of unusual power and originality. 575 pp. $1.75.

GROWTH

By GRAHAM TRAVERS,

Author of "Mona Maclean."

A novel of student life in Edinburgh. "Throbbing with the tragedies and comedies of real men and women."—*N. Y. Times Review.*

HENRY HOLT & CO.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED